R5685-4
11/14/88

Volume 16, No. 10 **October 1988**

Special Election Issue: A Final Look at Campaign '88

FOCUS

The monthly magazine of the Joint Center for Political Studies®

The Supreme Court: Which Way on Civil Rights?

A Shifting High Court Majority Casts Uncertainty on the Future of Constitutional Protections

No Income Gains for Blacks

Census Data Show That the Income Gap Between Black and White Families Grew From 1986 to 1987

After the Zero Option

Recently Released Joint Center Study Examines Three Defense Policy Options Available to the Next President

POLITICAL TRENDLETTER®

Perspective

ISSN 0740-0195

PRICE $1.50

Voting Is an Exercise of Power

In last month's Perspective column, "Not Voting: An Option Blacks Cannot Afford," I urged readers to publicly reject the ill-conceived notion of not voting in the November elections. Staying away from the polls would be an insult to our common sense and our heritage and an affront to the memory of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and to blacks' efforts over the years to become power players in the political arena. We continue with that theme in this month's issue, as this is the last opportunity to emphasize the importance of voting on November 8.

Much of the Joint Center's analysis of this election year has focused on the presidential campaign. But the names of the candidates vying for the Oval Office will not be the only ones to appear on the ballots. And we would be remiss if we failed to underscore the importance of congressional, statewide, and local elections.

Many of these contests will be close and hard fought. Many of the candidates in these races are black men and women seeking to continue their leadership as incumbents in Congress, in state legislatures, and on city councils and school boards. Others are taking their first steps into elective office.

Both partisan and nonpartisan elections will require thoughtful choices between candidates. Many ballots will address specific issues like referenda on tax levies to raise revenues for education, housing, and health facilities, on the banning of handguns, and on school desegregation.

When some voters say, "My one vote doesn't count," or contend that "it really doesn't matter who gets elected anyway," they are forsaking their chance to influence not only the nation's direction but the direction policies will take in their local communities as well.

Your vote does make a difference. The election of Alex Williams, the first black state's attorney in Prince George's County, Maryland, has made a difference. Williams was the first state's attorney to establish a means by which those complaining of the excessive use of force by police could seek a fair hearing. Mayor Jessie Rattley of Newport News, Virginia, the first black to serve as chief executive in that city, which is 31 percent black, is another who has made a difference. She played a major role in the economic development of her city's black community. Mayor Unita Blackwell, of Mayersville, Mississippi, the first black female mayor in that state, has also made a difference in this predominantly black town by providing city assistance to low-income residents and senior citizens. And the 1986 election of Mississippi Congressman Mike Espy has made a difference to the thousands of blacks in his heavily rural district. The first black Mississippian to serve in Congress since the days of Reconstruction, Espy has helped his constituents in many ways, including securing federal housing loans and grants for low-income and elderly residents.

Your vote also makes a difference in the selection of white public servants whose performance in office has an impact on our communities.

Voting is an exercise of power. In a democratic society power is a trust. Those who have it are accountable for exercising it as well as for their failure to exercise it. ■

Eddie N. Williams

PRESIDENT

FOCUS Copyright © 1988 Joint Center for Political Studies, Inc.® The monthly magazine of the **Joint Center for Political Studies,** 1301 Pa. Ave., N.W., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20004 (202) 626-3500. The Joint Center for Political Studies is a national, nonprofit, tax-exempt institution that conducts research on public policy issues of special concern to black Americans and promotes informed and effective involvement of blacks in the governmental process. Founded in 1970, the Joint Center provides independent and nonpartisan analyses through research, publication, and outreach programs. Opinions expressed in signed *Focus* articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Joint Center for Political Studies. *Focus* is published monthly. $15.00 per year by JCPS, Inc.

PRESIDENT/Eddie N. Williams
VICE PRESIDENT/Eleanor Farrar
DIRECTOR OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT/Kathleen Vander Horst
DIRECTOR OF FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION/Brenda Watkins Noel
DIRECTOR OF INFORMATION RESOURCES/Auriel Pilgrim
DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH/Milton Morris
DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL POLICY INSTITUTE/Russell Owens

ASSOC. DIR. OF COMMUNICATIONS, PUBLICATIONS, MEDIA RELATIONS & PUBLIC AFFAIRS/Frank Dexter Brown
ASSOC. DIR. OF COMMUNICATIONS, ELECTRONIC PROGRAMS/Mark Lloyd
EDITOR, *Focus*/David C. Ruffin
SENIOR EDITOR/Marc DeFrancis
CONTRIBUTING EDITOR/Linda F. Williams
ASSOCIATE EDITOR/Constance B. Toliver
TRENDLETTER RESEARCHER/Alfred Baltimore
WORD PROCESSOR/Merlinda Ceniza Novicio

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Wendell Freeland/Attorney at Law, *Chairman*
Andrew F. Brimmer/Brimmer and Company, Inc., *Vice Chairman*
Louis E. Martin/Calmar Communications, *Treasurer*
Bishop John Hurst Adams/Senior Bishop, A.M.E. Church
Robert McCormick Adams/Smithsonian Institution
Norma Asnes/Writer
Hannah D. Atkins/Secretary of State, Oklahoma
Lucius J. Barker/Washington University
Charles U. Daly/John F. Kennedy Library and Museum
Mervyn Dymally/U.S. House of Representatives
Marian Wright Edelman/Children's Defense Fund
Luther Hilton Foster/Alexandria, Virginia
Charles V. Hamilton/Columbia University
Jayne Brumley Ikard
Bernard Rapoport/American Income Life Insurance Co.
Eddie N. Williams/Joint Center for Political Studies

Members Emeriti: William B. Boyd, Robert C. Maynard, James D. Wolfensohn

Eleanor Farrar/JCPS, *Secretary to the Board*

The Supreme Court: Which Way on Civil Rights?

A Shifting High Court Majority Casts Uncertainty on the Future of Constitutional Protections

by Frank R. Parker

As the Supreme Court reconvened in October, the civil rights community was still reeling from the Court's announcement last April that it was reconsidering its 1976 *Runyon v. McCrary* decision. The *Runyon* ruling had expanded the protections against private racial discrimination established by the 1866 Civil Rights Act. The Court's surprise order in the *Patterson v. McLean Credit Union* case jeopardizes the 12-year-old precedent established by the *Runyon* decision, which civil rights litigants had come to rely on.

The decision to reconsider *Runyon*—something that no one had requested, not even the Reagan administration Justice Department—raises serious concerns about the future of the Supreme Court's enforcement of civil rights protections. Coming when it did, that decision was a shock to the civil rights community, which has enjoyed a string of judicial triumphs over the past seven years.

Indeed, as a result of vigorous resistance by civil rights forces, the Reagan administration has been largely unsuccessful in implementing its anti-civil-rights agenda through Supreme Court decisions. The Court has rejected the administration's attacks on affirmative action in employment, has struck down the administration's attempt to restore tax-exempt status to segregated private schools, has refused to condemn busing to achieve public school desegregation, and has rejected Justice Department interpretations that would weaken enforcement of the Voting Rights Act. The Supreme Court's reconsideration of *Runyon* has aroused some civil rights advocates from the false sense of euphoria that the recent series of victories had produced.

Steady Erosion of Protections

That series of victories may have masked a distinctly conservative trend in the Court—a steady erosion of some of the legal protections against discrimination which have been established over the past 24 years through legislation, executive orders, and court decisions. Some civil rights lawyers argue that this back-sliding in discrimination decisions has done little damage. In fact, the damage has been limited only because many of these cases have involved Supreme Court interpretations of federal civil rights statutes, which Congress has then amended with the effect of overturning the adverse Court decisions. Here are the most prominent examples:

- In 1976 in *General Electric Company v. Gilbert,* the Supreme Court undermined efforts to eliminate sex discrimination in the work place. The Court held that an employer's medical benefits and disability plan that excluded compensation for medical problems arising out of pregnancy and childbirth were not a form of sex discrimination prohibited by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The decision was strongly condemned by women's and civil rights organizations, and two years later Congress passed the Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978, in effect overturning the *Gilbert* decision.

- In 1980 the Supreme Court ruled in *City of Mobile v. Bolden* that at-large elections in Mobile, Alabama, which excluded blacks from election to city council seats, were unlawful only if the plaintiffs could prove they were adopted or maintained with a racially discriminatory intent. Proof of discriminatory intent, the Court held, was required by both the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution and the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The *Mobile* decision evoked a firestorm of protest among legal scholars and civil rights advocates. Critics pointed out that discriminatory intent is difficult to prove and that the justices themselves could not agree on a proper legal standard for determining it. Again, however, Congress took action, nullifying the impact of the *Mobile* decision in 1982 by amending the Voting Rights Act to eliminate the *intent* requirement, thereby allowing plaintiffs to show that challenged election laws have discriminatory *results.*

- The Reagan administration's most clear-cut anti-civil-rights victory in the Supreme Court came with the *Grove City College v. Bell* case. In that 1984 decision, the Court

---

Mr. Parker is Director of the Voting Rights Project of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law in Washington, D.C. He was the MacArthur Foundation Distinguished Scholar at the Joint Center from 1985 to 1986.

accepted the administration's position that civil rights statutes barring discrimination in the use of federal funds apply only to the particular program within the institution receiving the money and not to the institution as a whole. It took Congress four years to correct the Court's misinterpretation of congressional intent by passing the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1988, which in effect overturned the *Grove City* ruling.

With these decisions, among others, the Court clearly shifted toward restricting civil rights protections. And one of the most damaging trends in that direction has been its expansion of the requirement that civil rights plaintiffs prove discriminatory intent to establish a constitutional violation. This trend began even before *Mobile,* with the Supreme Court's 1976 ruling in *Washington v. Davis*. In that decision, the Court held that black job applicants challenging discrimination in hiring by the Washington, D.C., police department were required to prove discriminatory intent. This decision was not necessarily dictated by prior precedents—the Court had gone both ways on this issue in earlier decisions. In adopting the intent requirement in its *Washington* decision, the Supreme Court majority knew it was making it more difficult for victims of racial discrimination to prove a violation of federal law.

> ***As the Reagan administration leaves office, its anti-civil-rights agenda might yet be implemented through its legacy of lifetime judicial appointments. That concern was heightened by the appointment this year of Justice Anthony Kennedy.***

Few Clear-Cut Victories

Even in the cases over the last decade in which civil rights litigants have been most successful, their victories have not been as clear-cut as they had hoped. In several affirmative action cases the Supreme Court has consistently rejected the Reagan administration's argument that racial preferences are justified only to grant relief to specific identifiable victims of proven past discrimination. However, the Court has limited the use of affirmative action remedies, such as granting preferences to minorities and women in hiring and promotions, by holding that these remedies are not proper in all cases. The Court has required that these remedies must be "necessary" and "narrowly tailored" to address past discrimination. Furthermore, it has ruled that such remedies must not impose an "unacceptable burden" on white employees.

As Harvard Law School Professor Kathleen Sullivan argues in an article in the November 1986 issue of the *Harvard Law Review,* the Court's decisions have invited continued protest and litigation by whites who claim to be innocent victims of "reverse discrimination" caused by affirmative action remedies. The Court's decisions, Sullivan contends, also appear to have cast doubt on the use of affirmative action to remedy societal discrimination, to promote economic justice, and to allow employers to voluntarily pursue the goal of a more integrated work force.

An Uncertain Future

In the coming months, the Court is scheduled to confront a number of important civil rights issues, including:

- whether *Runyon v. McCrary* should be overruled *(Patterson v. McLean Credit Union)*; NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, Inc., director-counsel Julius Chambers has argued before the Court against overturning the *Runyon* decision.
- whether a Richmond, Virginia, minority set-aside program that reserves 30 percent of all public-works contracts for minority-owned firms is constitutional *(City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co.)*;
- whether white fire fighters in Birmingham, Alabama, should be allowed to file separate "reverse discrimination" lawsuits challenging an existing court order aimed at gaining more promotions for blacks and women in the city's fire department *(Martin v. Wilks)*;
- whether statistical evidence of employment discrimination showing that minorities are concentrated in low-paying jobs shifts the burden of proof to the company, requiring it to justify its hiring practices for white-dominated higher-paying jobs *(Wards Cove Packing Co. v. Atonio)*.

Even if the present Court does not vote to overrule important civil rights precedents, the future remains uncertain. As the Reagan administration leaves office, its anti-civil-rights agenda might yet be implemented through its legacy of lifetime judicial appointments. That concern was heightened by the appointment this year of Justice Anthony Kennedy, who sailed through the Senate confirmation process without revealing his position on most civil rights issues. Justice Kennedy had no demonstrated commitment to civil rights and, in fact, while a judge on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, had ruled against minorities and women in a number of civil rights cases. Kennedy's vote was critical in the 5-to-4 decision to reconsider the *Runyon* precedent, as he joined Chief Justice William Rehnquist, Justice Byron White, and the two other Reagan appointees, Justices Sandra Day O'Connor and Antonin Scalia, to form the majority. Kennedy's appointment is especially worrisome in that several important civil rights victories (including two of the last five major affirmative action cases) have been decided by narrow 5-to-4 votes, with Justice Lewis Powell (whom Kennedy replaced) as the critical swing vote.

Furthermore, it is likely that the three oldest justices, William Brennan, Thurgood Marshall, and Harry Blackmun (ages 82, 80, and 79), the pro-civil-rights core of the Court, will soon retire. The prospect of their being replaced during the next four years is unsettling. Indeed, the outcome of this election could determine the future of civil rights protections well into the next century. ■

October 1988

JCPS

POLITICAL TRENDLETTER®

Inside This Issue

- **Despite ongoing voter mobilization campaigns, the 1988 JCPS survey of black political attitudes and opinions reveals that black turnout may be low in this year's presidential election.**
- **Freshman Mississippi congressman Mike Espy battles to hold seat; Donald Payne set to become New Jersey's first black representative on Capitol Hill; other blacks fight for House and Senate posts.**
- **Across the Nation: Alabama court decision yields 238 new black elected officials; Prichard, Alabama, Mayor John Smith loses reelection bid; Charles Z. Smith is the first black named to the Washington State Supreme Court.**

One Last Look: Blacks and the '88 Presidential Race

As the presidential election between Massachusetts Governor MICHAEL DUKAKIS and Vice President GEORGE BUSH swings into its final phase, it appears that the overwhelming majority of blacks are likely to support Dukakis. The 1988 Joint Center/Gallup survey of the electorate reveals that 83 percent of the blacks who definitely plan to vote on November 8 will cast their ballots for the Massachusetts governor. Still, a number of developments may erode black support for Dukakis:

- Although our survey shows that blacks are registered at a rate that parallels that of whites, voter registration efforts have been minimal and slow to get off the ground this year. As a result, black voter turnout could be lower this year than it was in 1984. Census Bureau statistics show that since 1976, the turnout rate among blacks has tended to fall 10 percentage points below their registration rate. (For example, in 1984, blacks registered at a rate of 66.3 percent but 55.8 percent voted.)
- **Some blacks have become disaffected by what they perceive as the Democrats' "take the black vote for granted" attitude, and question whether they should vote at all. Our survey shows that only 51 percent of blacks definitely plan to vote in November. And at a voter participation workshop held during the recent Congressional Black Caucus 18th Annual Legislative Weekend, DAVID RICHARDSON, president of the National Caucus of Black State Legislators, and HERBERT REID, counsel and advisor to Washington, D.C., Mayor MARION BARRY, both suggested that blacks might do well to teach the Democrats a lesson and vote with their bottoms.**
- Then there is independent candidate **LENORA FULANI's** quest to "Dump the Duke" by winning a sizable minority of the black vote. Fulani, of the National Alliance Party, claims there is not a dime's worth of difference between Dukakis and Bush or the Democrats and the Republicans, so *both* parties need to be taught a lesson. Although Fulani is not expected to garner many votes (her own goal is one percent), even a small slippage in black support for Dukakis could deny the Democrats victory in an exceptionally close race.

To mitigate any harm these developments might bring to the Democrats, presidential contender JESSE JACKSON and a host of black groups have been more active over the past month in their support of Dukakis and in mobilizing black voters. At the Congressional Black Caucus annual awards dinner on September 17, Jackson spoke passionately on behalf of the Dukakis/Bentsen ticket. He pointed to the critical differences between the stances Dukakis and Bush have taken on the issues, including universal same-day voter registration, the appointment of Supreme Court and other federal judicial nominees, granting statehood to the District of Columbia, financial aid for low-income college students, and sanctions against South Africa. Dukakis, he said, stood with blacks on these issues; Bush did not. Jackson also argued that blacks in America and elsewhere around the world (especially now, South Africa) had fought too long and lost too many lives in pursuit of the right to vote for them to ignore the franchise. "Vote heavy and vote Dukakis" was clearly the mandate Jackson sought to give black America.

Other efforts to increase black voter participation include the National Black Leadership Roundtable's (NBLR) "Participate in '88" tours of 14 key states where blacks can provide the margin of victory. The tours began in September with emphasis on registration and will end with a push for massive black turnout. Participating in the tours are nationally known black leaders such as entertainer Dick Gregory, human rights activist Coretta Scott King, labor leader Bill Lucy, Atlanta Mayor Andrew Young, former congresswoman Shirley Chisholm, and members of the Congressional Black Caucus. The 14 targeted states are California, Georgia, Illinois, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

Unlike NBLR's effort, which combines partisan and nonpartisan activities, the National Coalition on Black Voter Participation's registration and turnout drives are all nonpartisan. The Coalition is working in 29 states, which include the 14 states the NBLR is focusing on as well as Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Indiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nebraska, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Washington, and West Virginia. In each state the Coalition's effort, which is known as Operation Big Vote, works through affiliations with local voter registration organizations.

Blacks in the Often Forgotten Legislative Races

Although the presidential contest has overshadowed everything else in electoral politics this year, it is not the only important race. Besides state legislative and local contests, there are important races for the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate in which blacks are candidates.

Most of the 23 incumbent black Congressmen have "safe seats." Even **HAROLD FORD** (D-Tenn.), once thought to be vulnerable because of federal indictments against him for bank, mail, and tax fraud, has no Republican opponent in the general election. He faces only a weak challenge from **ISAAC ROBINSON,** a little-known candidate who is running as an independent.

The only black congressional incumbent at risk is young (age 34) freshman Democratic Mississippian MIKE ESPY, the first black congressman from the state since Reconstruction. Espy, who represents the 2nd District of Mississippi's rural delta region, is faced with the threat of a large and unsympathetic white voter turnout in the 53 percent black district. White voters may be drawn to the polls by the state's heated U.S. Senate race in which two incumbent congressmen, eight-term House Republican whip **TRENT LOTT** and four-term Democrat **WAYNE DOWDY,** are vying for the seat of Democrat **JOHN STENNIS** who is retiring after 41 years in Congress. A referendum, sponsored by Democratic Gov. Ray Mabus, to decide whether county boards of supervisors should have more centralized authority, is also expected to generate a large white turnout.

This potentially large white turnout may make it necessary for Espy to expand not only black voter participation but his base of white support as well. In 1986, black turnout was only 42 percent, and Espy beat white Republican incumbent **WEBB FRANKLIN** in a close contest (52 percent to 48 percent) by securing about 12 percent of the white vote. **Espy's reelection bid this year is made even more difficult by the fact that his Republican opponent, JACK COLEMAN, an attorney and corporate lobbyist, is engaging in negative campaign tactics similar to those being used in the Bush presidential campaign. Coleman has called Espy unpatriotic and weak on defense, and has tried to label him as a left-wing radical. And Mississippi's more racist past recently resurfaced when vandals carved the word "nigger" on the door of Espy's home; the guilty party or parties have not been apprehended. Ironically, this incident may actually be helping Espy. He has received a rising number of calls from whites voicing their support for him and condemning the racist act. Recent polls taken for the Espy campaign show him with support from 40 percent of white voters and 66 percent of the overall electorate. Most political observers expect Espy to win despite all the obstacles he is facing, although they expect the race to be close.**

Among likely newcomers to Congress is Newark's Democratic City Councilman **DONALD PAYNE,** in New Jersey's 10th District. Payne cleared the biggest hurdle in his campaign to become the state's first black congressman by defeating fellow Newark City Councilman **RALPH T. GRANT, JR.** (who is also black) in the June

Democratic primary. With that victory, Payne is practically assured the seat of retiring 20-term Democratic Rep. **PETER RODINO, JR.**, in the heavily Democratic and 58 percent black district. Payne enjoyed a big fund-raising edge over Grant and obtained key endorsements, including those from **RAYMOND DURKIN,** chairman of the New Jersey and Essex County Democratic parties, and Newark Mayor **SHARPE JAMES.** Payne's primary victory and solid name recognition resulted, in part, from his 1980 and 1986 campaigns against Rodino. In November, he will face black Republican **MICHAEL WEBB** of East Orange. But since there is almost no GOP presence among the district's voters, independent candidate **ANTHONY IMPERIALE,** a former state senator from Newark's Italian North Ward, is likely to draw more attention and votes than Webb. Payne is widely expected to win.

The fate of three other black candidates for Congress, **FAYE WILLIAMS** of Louisiana. **RON CRUTCHER** of Ohio, and **HELEN BARNHILL** of Wisconsin, remains less certain. Williams, a Democratic candidate for Louisiana's 8th Congressional District (Alexandria), is considered to have the best chance of the three. She won 49 percent of the district's vote in 1986 when she was narrowly defeated by Republican **CLYDE HOLLOWAY** in her bid for the open seat. This year, Williams built on her 1986 campaign base to qualify for the November runoff, and a second electoral showdown against Holloway in the majority Democratic district which is 38 percent black. She came out of the October 1 open primary ahead of three white Democrats: former Lt. Gov. **BOBBY FREEMAN,** State Sen. **J.E. JUMONVILLE,** and former Alexandria Mayor **JOHN SNYDER.** Although Williams garnered 34 percent of the vote in that primary, first-term congressman Holloway was the top vote-getter in the five-candidate field, with 43 percent. **Williams is seeking to increase black turnout and go well beyond the 27,000 white votes she won in 1986. Her campaign is better organized this year: she is working with professional media consultants and has raised more money than in 1986. Still, Holloway's incumbency will make Williams' battle an uphill one.**

Ron Crutcher was unopposed in his quest for the Republican nomination to earn a second chance to be elected to Ohio's 3rd district, which includes the declining industrial community of Dayton. He faces five-term incumbent Democrat **TONY HALL,** who defeated Crutcher in 1986. The biggest challenge for Crutcher, who won 35 percent of the vote in 1986, is to gain a larger share of votes (the district is 82 percent Democratic) and a larger Democratic share of white votes (the district is 81 percent white and only 18 percent black). But with campaign support from the likes of **OLIVER NORTH** (who is under indictment for his part in the Iran-Contra scandal), it is questionable how many votes Crutcher can attract, even among blacks.

Republican management consultant and civic leader Helen Barnhill faces slightly better prospects than Crutcher. Running against three-term incumbent Democrat **JIM MOODY** in Wisconsin's 5th District (Milwaukee), Barnhill, who won the Republican primary by 2-to-1, is mounting a serious challenge. She believes her campaign was aided by Moody's last-minute decision to drop out of the race for the U.S. Senate and instead seek to retain his seat in the House. Barnhill, a former case worker for the Milwaukee Urban League, is on the board of three colleges and a local hospital. She is well known among the district's blacks, who comprise 22 percent of it's voting-age population. Running on a platform that addresses the issues of drug abuse, education, jobs, and economic development in her region, Barnhill emphasizes that she is not a "Reaganite Republican." Barnhill's staff believes that if she can win the white Republican vote and the lion's share of the black vote, she can score an upset victory over Moody. Nevertheless, given the popularity of the incumbent, who ran unopposed in his last two campaigns, Barnhill's chances for victory are not good.

In Senate elections, two black Republicans face near-impossible odds against well known and well financed opponents. In Virginia, Rev. **MAURICE DAWKINS** is running against popular former Democratic Governor **CHARLES ROBB.** When Dawkins was nominated, the state's GOP leaders admitted it would take nothing short of a political miracle for him to defeat Robb. Since then, the Dawkins campaign has been hit by major snafus: organizational problems, ineffective fund-raising, and the lack of support from key Republicans in the state. For example, prominent black Republican Dr. **FRANK ROYALL,** noted for his work in developing the Richmond Community Hospital and Meharry Medical College, accepted a position on the finance committee of Robb's campaign. This is particularly telling, because Royall has been strongly allied with state Republican leaders, including former Governor **JOHN D. DALTON.**

Maryland's black Senate nominee, Republican **ALAN KEYES,** is seeking to garner a large share of the black vote as a part of his campaign strategy. But Keyes' methods of winning black votes are almost sure to fail. Often sounding like a professor of Reaganite ideology in his speeches, Keyes has attacked Jesse Jackson as representing "the politics of hopelessness," and he has criticized federal programs for public housing and job creation and those that serve the poor in general. Meanwhile, Keyes favors military aid to "foreign revolutionaries" such as the Nicaraguan Contras and the UNITA rebels in Angola who are armed, trained, and financed by South Africa. In this heavily Democratic state, Keyes is certainly a long shot against popular incumbent Democratic Sen. **PAUL SARBANES.**

Across the Nation

ALABAMA: The ruling that at-large elections in Alabama dilute black voter strength, issued last June by U.S. District Judge **MYRON THOMPSON,** has already borne fruit. Since Thompson's decision in Dillard v. Crenshaw County et. al., over 180 governmental jurisdictions in Alabama have been required to abandon at-large election systems. According to **JEROME GRAY**, field director of the Alabama Democratic Conference, the black political organization which filed the suit, the ruling has directly resulted in the election of blacks to many government posts for the first time, including 200 new city council members, 23 school board members, and 15 county commissioners.

In other state news, three-term Republican Mayor JOHN SMITH, of Prichard, who is also president of the National Conference of Black Mayors, lost his post in August when he finished last in a three-way election. In a September 13 runoff, MARGIE WILSON, a white real estate broker who has never held public office, narrowly defeated black health planning consultant and political newcomer JESSE NORWOOD by 121 votes. Wilson, who lost a close race to Smith in the 1984 mayoral race, garnered 38 percent of the black vote in the runoff election. Prichard is 60 percent black.

Smith's defeat appears to be tied to the hard times this town (population 38,000) has recently faced. Prichard is one of the poorest municipalities in Alabama, with nearly 40 percent of its residents living below the poverty level. Beset by financial problems over the past year, the municipal government has had difficulty paying its workmen's compensation bills. Development projects in the city have been put on hold, including the extension of its sewer system which has been held up due to violations of the state's environmental standards. Wilson, however, will be better armed to deal with the city's problems than was her predecessor. The Alabama state legislature recently passed a "strong mayor-weak council" measure, giving the mayor of Prichard new powers over the administration of city affairs, including finances and personnel appointments. Local observers suggest that Smith, operating under the old "weak mayor" system, had little power to address the city's woes.

MICHIGAN: Detroit Mayor **COLEMAN YOUNG** is expected to seek reelection next year for a fifth term in office. Young, who was first elected in 1973, begins his campaign with a massive war chest and should be a shoo-in at the polls. Nevertheless, he faces opposition from two likely challengers: **TOM BARROW,** a part owner of the CPA firm Barrow and Aldridge, and businessman **CHARLES COSTA.** Barrow, who got 39 percent of the vote in his unsuccessful race against Young in 1985, has increased his name recognition and visibility by successfully leading the fight to prevent the legalization of casino gambling, which Young had supported. Young has had other setbacks, including criticism for million-dollar cost overruns for municipal land acquisitions designed to attract new General Motors and Chrysler plants to the city. For all that the city is spending on the projects, the automobile companies are not producing enough jobs, in the opinion of some observers, to make it worthwhile. Despite these problems, Young will probably have little trouble keeping his job as mayor.

TENNESSEE: The fragility of black political gains comes to mind whenever comparisons are made between today's society and the days of Reconstruction. In many instances, political offices blacks held before the turn of the century have only recently been regained. This is the case in Shelby County (Memphis). In the 1880s, two blacks held countywide executive offices: **FRED HUNT** was the Recorder of Deeds and **F. F. CASSELS** the Collector of Port. Now, for the first time in 100 years, Shelby County, which is 42 percent black, again has a black countywide executive. On September 1, 1988, Memphis real estate appraiser and City Councilman **MICHAEL HOOKS,** who is also the nephew of NAACP executive director **Benjamin Hooks,** was elected county tax assessor.

His victory has prompted a wide field of candidates to run for the 4th District council seat he is vacating. One candidate is his wife, **JANET HOOKS,** who while never having held office before, has played a prominent role in many local campaigns. A second candidate is **TALIB-KARIM MUHAMMAD,** a member of the Nation of Islam. Muhammad, who said his campaign "will be upbeat" and "above the Rent-A-Negro, Business-As-Usual mentality that prevails in the political arena today." Also running is **MINNERVA JOHNICAN,** the first black woman to serve on the Shelby County Commission and the first black to be elected to an at-large city council seat. She had to give up her council seat to run for mayor of Memphis last year. Among the other candidates are: Rev. **KENNETH WHALUM, SR.,** pastor of Mt. Olivet Baptist Church and a trustee of LeMoyne-Owen College, and **JOHN DEBERRY,** a film technician with a local television station, who was defeated twice before by Michael Hooks in separate attempts to win the 4th District seat.

VERMONT: University of Vermont professor DOLORES SANDOVAL's bid for Vermont's single at-large House seat was a long shot from the beginning, and it is no surprise that she was among the losers of the September Democratic primary. Local political observers note that she did not address issues of primary concern to the state's electorate and was unable to raise enough money to mount an effective campaign. While the other three candidates in Vermont's open-seat race stressed state-level issues and experience, Sandoval spent most of her campaign discussing national and international issues. All told, Sandoval raised only $15,000 and won just seven percent of the vote (blacks are less than one percent of the state's total population). The victor of the four-candidate Democratic primary was **PAUL POIRER,** the State House Majority Leader, who was endorsed by three-quarters of the Democratic legislators.

WASHINGTON: University of Washington Law School Professor Emeritus **CHARLES Z. SMITH** was appointed by Gov. **BOOTHE GARDNER** to the State Supreme Court on July 13. Smith had become the first black judge in the state when he was named to the municipal court in Seattle 23 years ago. He made his mark nationally when, as a special assistant to Attorney General **ROBERT KENNEDY,** he supervised the grand jury investigation of mail and wire fraud by former Teamsters Union President **JAMES (JIMMY) HOFFA** in the early 1960s. Hoffa was eventually convicted. Gov. Gardner's press secretary, **DICK MILNE,** said Smith's racial background "was a factor" in his appointment, but added that "it was not an overriding factor. Our preference was to find a minority if we could, but the number one criterion always was the best person for the job." Judge Smith downplayed the importance of being the first black justice of the highest court in the state. **"I am not one who particularly cares about being the first anything," he said. However, the 61-year-old Smith added that if his appointment made him a role model "then I think it is worthwhile."**

No Income Gains for Blacks

Census Data Show That the Income Gap Between Black and White Families Grew From 1986 to 1987

by Drs. Joyce E. Allen and Margaret C. Simms

One of the themes of the fall presidential campaign is economic opportunity: both Vice President George Bush and Massachusetts Governor Michael Dukakis are promising more and better jobs if they are elected president. This issue, while important to all Americans, is especially vital to blacks. Although they may have accrued some benefits from the economic expansion of the last six years, blacks are nevertheless underrepresented in the higher-paying jobs currently available (see *Focus*, April 1988, "Black Youth Face an Uncertain Jobs Future"). This has been confirmed by data recently released by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, which show that there was practically no growth in the incomes of black families from 1986 to 1987, and that black families were worse off relative to whites in 1987. Over that one-year period, white families had real income gains while black families did not. This remained true regardless of family structure, the number of earners in their households, or whether the head of the household worked a full-time job year-round.

Gap Between Blacks and Whites Grows

The median income for black families in 1987 as measured in real income (income adjusted for inflation) was $18,098, virtually unchanged from 1986 (all money figures expressed in constant 1987 dollars). The comparable figures for whites were $32,274 in 1987 and $31,935 in 1986. Thus, the ratio of black to white incomes fell from 57.1 percent in 1986 to 56.1 percent in 1987. And black families of every structural type lost ground when compared to their white counterparts. The black-white ratio declined for families headed by married couples, including those where the wife was in the labor force, and for families headed by a single female householder (see table 1).

The stagnation in black family income during this period occurred at all income levels, with families at both the upper and the lower ends of the income spectrum failing to gain. In fact, the proportion of black families with

(Continued on page 6)

Table 1. Median Family Income[a] and Black-White Income Ratio, by Family Type, 1987 and 1986

	1987			1986		
	White	Black	Ratio	White	Black	Ratio
All Families	$32,274*	$18,098	56.1%	$31,935	$18,247	57.1%
Married Couple	35,295*	27,182	77.0	34,647	27,554	79.5
Wife in Labor Force	41,023*	33,333	81.3	40,396	33,116	82.0
Wife not in Labor Force	27,394	16,822	61.4	27,386	17,379	63.5
Male Head[b]	26,230	17,455	66.5	27,206	19,415	71.4
Female Head[b]	17,018*	9,710	57.1	16,290	9,640	59.2

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Money Income and Poverty Status in the United States: 1987* (Advance data from the March 1988 *Current Population Survey*), P-60, No. 161 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988)

[a] Expressed in 1987 dollars.
[b] No spouse present.
* Significantly different from 1986 income level.

Dr. Allen is a senior research associate and Dr. Simms is a deputy director of research at the Joint Center.

Table 2. Poverty Rates for Families and Individuals, by Race, 1987 and 1986

	1987		1986	
	White	Black	White	Black
All Families	8.2%	29.9%	8.6%	28.0%
Married Couple	5.2	12.3	5.6	10.8
Male head[a]	10.3	24.3	8.8	24.9
Female head[a]	26.7	51.8	28.2	50.1
Individuals	10.5	33.1	11.0	31.1
Under age 18[b]	15.4	45.6	15.8	43.0
Age 65 and over	10.1	33.9	10.7	31.0
In female headed families	26.4	53.8	27.9	52.9
Under age 18	45.8	68.3	46.3	67.1

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Money Income and Poverty Status in the United States: 1987.* P-60, No. 161.

[a] No spouse present.
[b] All figures for population under age 18 refer to related children only.

annual incomes of less than $2,500 rose from 4.4 percent to 5 percent. This marks the second consecutive year in which the proportion of black families at the very bottom of the income range increased. However, there was a slight decline in the percentage of white families in this income range, from 1.4 percent in 1986 to 1.3 percent in 1987.

At the upper ends of the income range, the proportion (and absolute numbers) of black families with incomes from $25,000 to $49,999 declined. In 1987, 26.4 percent of families were in this category, compared to 27.5 percent a year earlier. Meanwhile, the proportion of black families with real income of $50,000 and above remained constant at 9.5 percent last year, the first year since 1982 that the proportion of black families in this income range did not grow. During this period, the proportion of white families with incomes from $25,000 to $49,999 rose from 39 percent to 39.3 percent while the proportion with incomes of $50,000 and above climbed from 23.7 percent to 24.4 percent.

One reason for the large income gap between black and white families is that white householders are more likely to work full-time, year-round; naturally, these families have the highest incomes of all. In 1987, only 46 percent of black families had a household head who was employed full-time, year-round, compared to 60 percent of white families. Census data further indicate that of all black families with at least one householder working full-time, year-round, only those with four or more earners (just 2 percent of all black families) enjoyed significant income gains. Families with fewer than four earners gained very little.

Rising Poverty Levels

The 1987 census data also show that blacks are slipping further into poverty. The already high and still growing rate of poverty (the proportion of the population with incomes below the poverty line) among blacks indicates that the U.S. economy, even during the current recovery, is failing to bring a large proportion of black adults into expanding job markets.

Blacks, whose poverty rate rose two percentage points, from 31 percent in 1986 to 33 percent in 1987,* account for approximately 12 percent of the U.S. population but comprise nearly one-third of those in poverty. During that time, the poverty rate for whites declined slightly, from 11 percent to 10.5 percent (see table 2). An additional 9 percent of the black population lived at a level near poverty in 1987, their incomes being within 125 percent of the poverty line; this is approximately twice the percentage for the white population.

The poverty rate for black children remained high: 46 percent for those under 18 years and 68 percent for those in families headed by women. These rates were up slightly from the previous year. The poverty rate for white children, however, decreased slightly, from 15.8 percent to 15.4 percent, widening the gap between the races. Black children are now three times as likely as whites to live in poverty.

(Continued on page 8)

Table 3. Poverty Rates by Work Experience of Householder, by Race and Family Type, 1987

	All Families		Female-Headed Families	
	White	Black	White	Black
Total	8.2%	30.4%	26.7%	51.8%
Worked	5.4	17.5	16.6	33.4
50-52 weeks	2.9	8.2	7.0	16.0
Full time	2.4	6.4	5.0	12.3
1-49 weeks	16.2	41.3	40.8	65.3
Did not work	18.4	58.2	46.3	77.3
Percent of Householders				
Who worked	78.3	68.4	66.0	58.0
Full time[a]	60.2	46.2	41.4	34.2
1-49 weeks	14.9	19.1	18.7	20.5
Who did not work	21.7	31.6	34.0	42.0

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Money Income and Poverty Status in the United States: 1987. P-60, No. 161.*

[a] Full time, year-round.

The amount of income required for a family to be designated above the poverty line is calculated according to family size. In 1987, a family of four was considered to be in poverty if its annual income was below $11,611.

After the Zero Option

Recently Released Joint Center Study Examines Three Defense Policy Options Available to the Next President

The treaty to eliminate U.S. and Soviet intermediate nuclear force (INF) weapons, activated last June in Moscow by President Ronald Reagan and General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev, opens a new set of questions about the future of U.S. defense policy in Europe and the future of international arms control. Known as a "zero option" agreement because it eliminates a whole class of nuclear missiles, the INF treaty calls for the Soviets to destroy twice as many weapons as the United States. But the treaty also brings into sharper relief the numerical advantages that the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies retain in conventional non-nuclear air and ground forces.

In *After the Zero Option,* a new publication of the Joint Center for Political Studies, Dr. Edwin Dorn explores three alternatives (discussed below) from which the next administration might choose in this redefined strategic environment. Dr. Dorn is a deputy director of research at the Joint Center; his study was supported by the Kettering Foundation and the Ford Foundation.

- **"Zero-Plus": Shoring Up Conventional Strength.** One possible approach to defense policy, which Dorn calls the "zero-plus" option, would compensate for the loss of nuclear capability by upgrading the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's (NATO) conventional forces. However, the United States can increase its own NATO contingent only by increasing the total size and cost of its armed forces, or by transferring units to Europe from other parts of the world. This creates a dilemma, since doing the former would exacerbate the guns-versus-butter trade-off in U.S. federal budget policy, while transferring troops would reduce the nation's ability to meet other strategic commitments.

- **No-First-Use: A Remedy for the Hair-Trigger Problem.** A second option, widely known as "no-first-use," would alter NATO's military forces and tactics so that Western Europe could be defended without early reliance on nuclear weapons. This approach was first proposed by a bipartisan group of defense experts in 1982 and recently resurfaced as one of Jesse Jackson's 1988 presidential campaign issues. Proponents argue that it would reduce Soviet fears—and consequently the danger of hair-trigger nuclear exchanges—stemming from NATO's current strategic plan. NATO envisions the possibility of initiating a limited nuclear exchange if it is overwhelmed in an attack by conventional Warsaw Pact forces.

Both of the 1988 presidential candidates, Massachusetts Governor Michael Dukakis and Vice President George Bush, have rejected the no-first-use approach. One argument raised against it is that no-first-use would remove a proven deterrent to Soviet conventional aggression in Western Europe. But Dorn suggests that the no-first-use option is worth reconsideration, especially since there is a great deal of "uncertainty over whether there can be such a thing as a limited nuclear exchange."

- **"Zero-Minus": Drawing Back From Europe.** A third alternative examined in the study is the "zero-minus" option, the use of the INF treaty as "the first step toward a reduced U.S. military commitment to Western Europe." The United States' massive budget deficit is one factor that may cause increasing numbers of Americans to press for the removal of some of the 300,000 U.S. military personnel now stationed in Europe. Two major questions for U.S. policy makers, according to Dorn, will be whether to resist those domestic pressures or accept their inevitability, and how to work out with America's European allies a reduction in the U.S. burden in Europe.

- **Other Options.** Absent from Dorn's list of likely new directions are two of the most commonly discussed approaches—the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) and the Reagan administration's Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START). "Whatever may be the merits of SDI in the long run," Dorn writes, "the technology needed to make it work will not be developed for at least a decade, if ever."

As for START, Dorn points out that even its proposed 50 percent bilateral reduction in bombers, submarine-launched ballistic missiles, and intercontinental ballistic missiles would still leave the two superpowers with enough nuclear weapons to annihilate each other: "Thus, deterrence based on mutual assured destruction, the strategy which has dominated U.S.-Soviet relations since the 1960s, would not be greatly affected by START."

According to Eddie N. Williams, president of the Joint Center, "*After the Zero Option* is a valuable primer that gives Americans sufficient background to ensure that the next occupant of the Oval Office has thought about the nation's defense choices and is willing to make the tough decisions." ■

Copies of *After the Zero Option: Now That Reagan and Gorbachev Have Agreed, What Happens Next?* can be purchased for $3.95 each through the Publications Clerk, Joint Center for Political Studies, 1301 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20004; telephone 202-626-3500.

This review was prepared by Marc DeFrancis, senior editor at the Joint Center.

No Income Gains for Blacks

(Continued from page 6)

The difference in family structure partly explains this racial disparity. A much higher proportion of black children are living in households headed by single women. When one adjusts the figures to account for that fact, the gap does become smaller, but it remains significant, probably due to differences between the job opportunities available to black and white women. Generally, white women have access to more and higher-paying jobs because of differences in education and work experience and because of employer discrimination against minorities. In 1987, only 34 percent of all black women heading households actually worked full-time, year-round, compared to 41 percent of their white counterparts (see table 3, p. 6).

A comparison of 1986 and 1987 data on work experience shows that the growing poverty rate among black families is related to the growing gap between part-time wages and the cost of living. While the poverty rate held steady for other categories, it rose from 37 to 41 percent for black families in which the head worked only part of the year. For female-headed families, the rate increased from 60 percent to 65 percent. If these workers were to move from part-time to full-time employment and gain better job opportunities and better access to child care, the gap between the welfare of white children and that of black children would narrow significantly.

Closing the Gap

Blacks still have far to go before they achieve income parity with whites. Moreover, the data show that economic expansion alone is not sufficient to close the gap. Full-time, year-round employment in higher paying occupations will be a prerequisite for black advancement. Special attention should be paid to single black women who head households, since their children have the highest poverty rates of any group in the nation. The long-term effects on children raised in poverty are likely to lead to deeper poverty and greater social problems in the future. Black voters should weigh these issues carefully as they look toward a new presidential administration. ■

NEW!! JCPS PRESS

The Joint Center for Political Studies has entered into an agreement with the University Press of America (UPA) of Lanham, Maryland, and established the Joint Center for Political Studies Press.

This agreement allows UPA to print, market, and handle the fulfillment of publication orders for the Joint Center.

UPA printed the Joint Center's recently released publication, *Black Economic Progress: An Agenda for the 1990s*, and is handling the marketing and fulfillment of orders for that book. Forthcoming JCPS publications will be handled by UPA; and in the near future, publications previously obtained through the Joint Center's publications office may be ordered from: JCPS Press, Order Department, 4720 Boston Way, Lanham, Maryland, 20706; telephone 301-459-3366.

FOCUS
Joint Center for Political Studies®
1301 Pa. Ave., N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 626-3500

ADDRESS
CORRECTION
REQUESTED

Postmaster: Form 3547 requested

NOTICE TO READERS: Please notify FOCUS of any change of address or title. YOU MUST ATTACH THE MAILING LABEL FROM THE BACK COVER when writing about service or change of address. No change can be made without this information. Allow 6 weeks for change of address to take effect. Thank you.

NON-PROFIT
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT No. 6958
Washington, D.C.

26063
SRI
Acquisitions Editor
Congressional Info Svc, Inc.
4520 East-West Hwy.
Bethesda, MD 20814

R5685-4
1/20/89

Volume 16, Nos. 11 & 12 November-December 1988

FOCUS

The monthly magazine of the Joint Center for Political Studies®

A Child Care Agenda for the 1990s

Congress Will Consider Legislation to Provide Safe, Affordable Care to Children of Working Parents

The 1988 Election in Review

November Vote Showed Blacks Continue to Reject the GOP While Remaining an Uneasy Partner in the Democratic Coalition

PLUS:

Index to 1988 Issues of *Focus* and *Political TrendLetter*

POLITICAL TRENDLETTER®

Perspective

ISSN 0740-0195

PRICE $1.50

PERSPECTIVE

Bush's Chance With Blacks

As 1988 came to a close, President-elect George Bush was thinking seriously about putting two blacks in his cabinet. Should this come to pass, his administration would be the first to boast two black cabinet members.

The chances seem fairly good that Mr. Bush will come through. In fact, he has already nominated Dr. Louis Sullivan, president of the Morehouse School of Medicine in Atlanta, to be Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services. And while retired Lt. Gen. Julius Becton failed to get the nod to head the new Department of Veterans Affairs, as was expected, another black nomination may come down the pike early in 1989 to fill the new cabinet-level drug czar position.

Since Bush won only 12 percent of the black vote, even a single black cabinet appointment would raise his standing among blacks across the nation. But *two*? The very idea has sparked intense curiosity: What does George Bush *really* want from black Americans? That may be a cynical question, of course, but not an irrelevant one.

Perhaps the president-elect wants to relegate his racially divisive campaign to the past and to banish forever the spectre of Willie Horton. Perhaps he wants to dramatize his pursuit of a "kinder, gentler nation." A third possibility is that Bush wants to soften the blow of major budget cuts in social programs, which are expected early in his administration.

The most plausible explanation, however, might be found in Bush's search for future political support among black voters. Like Senator Robert Dole (R-Kan.) and former Republican National Committee chairman Bill Brock, Bush has advocated that the Republican party aggressively recruit blacks into its ranks. For the first time, he has a chance to do more than advocate.

If Bush is indeed serious about breaking the Democratic party's hammer lock on the black vote, he couldn't have picked a better moment. The confidence blacks place in the Democratic party is at an all-time low. Many blacks suspect party bigwigs of circulating the notion that black influence in the party is driving whites out.

Here are a couple of other factors that could strengthen Mr. Bush's hand. He is expected to give Fred McClure, a black vice president at Texas Air Corporation, the high-profile and influential position of assistant to the President for congressional relations. And, in nominating former New York congressman Jack Kemp to be Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Mr. Bush gains a cabinet officer who has close ties to some black leaders, who strongly believes that the GOP must recruit more blacks, and who is expected to name blacks to key subcabinet positions in his agency. Kemp will replace Samuel Pierce, the black HUD Secretary whom few blacks got to know and whom President Reagan once mistook for a mayor.

Clearly, the new President is in a position to score some public relations victories among blacks, and he will certainly win higher approval ratings from blacks than did Ronald Reagan. But getting blacks to change their partisanship will not be easy. Before that can happen, blacks must be convinced that the GOP seriously wants to make room for them. A 1987 national survey conducted by the Joint Center and the Gallup Organization showed just how difficult this task is likely to be: only 17 percent of all blacks surveyed thought the Republican party cared about their problems.

These data suggest that the Republican party has an enormous image problem in the black community. However, Bush's appointment of blacks to his administration and his use of his office to achieve a "kinder, gentler nation" could begin to solve that problem. ■

Eddie N. Williams

PRESIDENT

Copyright © 1988 Joint Center for Political Studies, Inc.®

FOCUS

The monthly magazine of the **Joint Center for Political Studies,** 1301 Pa. Ave., N.W., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20004 (202) 626-3500. The Joint Center for Political Studies is a national, nonprofit, tax-exempt institution that conducts research on public policy issues of special concern to black Americans and promotes informed and effective involvement of blacks in the governmental process. Founded in 1970, the Joint Center provides independent and nonpartisan analyses through research, publication, and outreach programs. Opinions expressed in signed *Focus* articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Joint Center for Political Studies. *Focus* is published monthly. $15.00 per year by JCPS, Inc.

PRESIDENT/Eddie N. Williams
VICE PRESIDENT/Eleanor Farrar
DIRECTOR OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT/Kathleen Vander Horst
DIRECTOR OF FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION/Brenda Watkins Noel
DIRECTOR OF INFORMATION RESOURCES/Auriel Pilgrim
DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH/Milton Morris
DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL POLICY INSTITUTE/Russell Owens

ASSOC. DIR. OF COMMUNICATIONS, PUBLICATIONS, MEDIA RELATIONS & PUBLIC AFFAIRS/Frank Dexter Brown
ASSOC. DIR. OF COMMUNICATIONS, ELECTRONIC PROGRAMS/Mark Lloyd
EDITOR, *Focus*/David C. Ruffin
SENIOR EDITOR/Marc DeFrancis
CONTRIBUTING EDITOR/Linda F. Williams
ASSOCIATE EDITOR/Constance B. Toliver
TRENDLETTER RESEARCHER/Alfred Baltimore
WORD PROCESSOR/Merlinda Ceniza Novicio

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Wendell Freeland/Attorney at Law, *Chairman*
Andrew F. Brimmer/Brimmer and Company, Inc., *Vice Chairman*
Louis E. Martin/Calmar Communications, *Treasurer*
Bishop John Hurst Adams/Senior Bishop, A.M.E. Church
Robert McCormick Adams/Smithsonian Institution
Norma Asnes/Writer
Hannah D. Atkins/Secretary of State, Oklahoma
Lucius J. Barker/Washington University
Charles U. Daly/John F. Kennedy Library and Museum
Mervyn Dymally/U.S. House of Representatives
Marian Wright Edelman/Children's Defense Fund
Luther Hilton Foster/Alexandria, Virginia
Charles V. Hamilton/Columbia University
Jayne Brumley Ikard
Bernard Rapoport/American Income Life Insurance Co.
Eddie N. Williams/Joint Center for Political Studies

Members Emeriti: William B. Boyd, Robert C. Maynard, James D. Wolfensohn

Eleanor Farrar/JCPS, *Secretary to the Board*

The 1988 Election in Review

November Vote Showed Blacks Continue to Reject the GOP While Remaining an Uneasy Partner in the Democratic Coalition

by Dr. Linda F. Williams

On the night of the 1986 midterm election, Senator Joseph Biden (D-Del.) concluded that the Democrats could not win the presidency in 1988 "unless they can maintain the multiracial coalition" which was at that moment enabling the party to recapture the U.S. Senate. Such a coalition, however, is precisely what did *not* happen last November 8. While nearly nine out of every 10 blacks voted for Michael Dukakis, almost six out of every 10 whites voted for George Bush.

Many pundits have concluded that racial polarization was key to Bush's victory just as it was to a whole string of prior Republican wins. This conclusion is a tempting one since, apart from Lyndon Johnson's landslide victory in 1964, one has to go back to 1944 to find a presidential election in which the Democrats captured more than 50 percent of the white vote. Indeed, the Democrats have lost five of the last six presidential elections and seven of the last 10.

During the last two presidential elections, the Democratic party has attempted to hold on to black voters, its most loyal constituency, while downplaying black influence in the party in hopes of stemming the flight of white voters. This situation has posed a dilemma for blacks: should they remain loyal to a party that has shown reluctance to embrace them as full partners? Or, alternatively, should they try to increase their numbers in the GOP even though, since the 1960s, the Republican party has been generally hostile to the interests of blacks, particularly during Ronald Reagan's two terms as president? As the Republicans contemplate their victory and the Democrats their defeat, the black vote may figure prominently in the plans of both parties as they assess the future viability of their coalitions.

Blacks: Not an Isolated Voting Bloc

Perhaps too much has been made of the idea that blacks have isolated themselves by their overwhelming support for the Democrats. According to CBS/*New York Times* exit polls, Dukakis won a slightly lower percentage of the black vote (86 percent) than Walter Mondale won in 1984 (89 percent). Conversely, 12 percent of blacks reported voting for George Bush—roughly three percentage points more than those who had reported voting for President Reagan in 1984.

Moreover, blacks were not unlike other groups in the society in their views on issues and their attitudes toward the Reagan administration. A CBS poll showed that preferences concerning major issues mattered little in voting decisions. For example, blacks were just as likely as whites to favor punishing criminals and to oppose raising taxes.

And Dukakis, after all, did not win 46 percent of the popular vote solely through black support. Along with blacks and some white Democratic regulars, two other minority groups strongly backed Dukakis: Hispanics and Jews (who voted for Dukakis by 69 and 64 percent respectively). Blacks who supported Dukakis were strong in their criticism of the Reagan administration. But they were not unique in their criticism. In the same poll, a substantial proportion of Hispanics and Jews described their vote as "a vote to change Reagan's policies."

Education and economics divided the electorate almost as much as race. CBS/*New York Times* exit polls showed that Dukakis won the majority of the vote of all those who had not graduated from high school as well as those who earned less than $25,000 in household income.

Finally, the idea that the black electorate is becoming more isolated is contradicted by the fact that in 1988 more whites voted for the presidential candidate supported by blacks than in any election since Jimmy Carter's 1976 campaign. In 1980, 36 percent of whites voted for Carter, and in 1984 only 34 percent voted for Walter Mondale, but in 1988, 40 percent of whites voted for Dukakis. Thus, although racial polarization persists, those who argue that it worsened in 1988 are mistaken.

Blacks Continue to Reject the GOP

Despite earlier predictions, the vast majority of blacks in every demographic category remained opposed to Bush's election throughout the 1988 campaign. There are several reasons why the GOP was unable to garner more black votes. One is that Bush inherited from the Reagan administration and the Republican party a legacy of hostility toward black Americans. This was exemplified by Reagan's drastic cuts in federal funding for human development programs and his attempts to dilute civil rights laws and weaken their enforcement. Bush's own actions as vice president, such as his concurrence with Reagan's veto of the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1988, did little to reassure blacks.

(Continued on page 8)

Dr. Williams is associate director of research at the Joint Center.

A Child Care Agenda for the 1990s

Congress Will Consider Legislation to Provide Safe, Affordable Care to Children of Working Parents

by Marian Wright Edelman

Every day more than two million American children between the ages of five and 13 come home from school to empty dwellings. In addition, the names of countless preschool children of working parents are on waiting lists of child care centers that cannot begin to respond to the demand.

The enormous nationwide need for child care reflects fundamental economic and demographic changes in our society that require increasing numbers of mothers to financially support or help support their families. These trends are abundantly evident in the black community. Almost two-thirds of all black mothers of preschool children hold jobs, and more than half of the preschool-age children in black two-parent families have both parents in the labor force.

The inadequate supply of child care facilities, however, is only one element of this nation's three-pronged child care crisis. The other two elements are cost and quality of care. It generally costs about $3,000 a year to keep one child in day care. At that price, care for two children is well beyond the means of families whose gross annual income is $9,000, which is about the median income of black families headed by single mothers.

The result is a two-tier child care system. More affluent families have the resources to send their children to day care and preschool programs that are safe and can provide a good foundation for future learning. But poor and minority children, who generally have the greatest need for child care that promotes learning skills, may be receiving care that is not even safe let alone educationally stimulating. Thus one portion of America's childhood population is enriched by day care programs while another receives services of varying quality.

How to respond, however, has been debated from churches and neighborhoods to the halls of Congress. The current system is not providing enough adequate day care services to meet the nation's needs. But a coalition of children's advocates will be pushing the 101st Congress to pass the Act for Better Child Care (ABC) as a means of addressing this growing problem. ABC, which was first introduced during the last Congress, is designed to make safe, low-cost, high-quality child care available to more families.

However, because each state has its own standards, day care is administered unevenly across the country. We know, for example, that very young children need individual attention to develop normally. Yet 30 states, including South Carolina, Arizona, and Florida, do not regulate the group size of preschool facilities. And 11 states allow an adult-child ratio in which a single adult may be responsible for 10 or more two-year-olds. In Illinois, for example, which allows a 1-to-8 adult-child ratio, a single adult was found to be caring for 47 youngsters in the basement of a center in Waukegan. The parents who put their children into that situation could afford no better; at $25 a week, the program cost one-third what most child care in that area cost. Along with group size, the training, skill, and attitude of child care staff are crucial to the quality of care. Nevertheless, seven states allow totally untrained persons to staff day care centers. ABC would require all regulated child care providers to complete a minimum of 15 hours of in-service training annually.

A Growing National Need

If we do not move now to improve our current child care system and add new resources, we will be missing an irreplaceable opportunity to prepare children for better futures. Among today's children, one in four is poor, one in seven is at risk of dropping out of school, and one in five is at risk of becoming a teen parent. Yet we already know that preschool education helps break the cycle of poverty, illiteracy, and early parenthood. Former preschool students are more likely than other low-income children to complete high school and be self-supporting.

According to a 1988 staff report of the House Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, every dollar invested in preschool education results in a savings of $6.00 that will not need to be spent further down the road in remedial education, higher welfare costs, and low worker productivity.

Reliable day care helps poor families become more self-sufficient as well. For example, a child care assistance program in Massachusetts which is part of the Education and Training (ET) program in that state, designed to help low-income mothers get off welfare, helped about half of

---

Ms. Edelman is the president of the Washington-based Children's Defense Fund.

November-December 1988

JCPS

POLITICAL TRENDLETTER®

Inside This Issue

- **Donald Payne is elected New Jersey's first black congressman; but all other non-incumbent blacks lose in their congressional races.**
- **Rep. William H. Gray becomes the fourth highest ranking House Democrat.**
- **House Judiciary panel considers a civil rights agenda for the 1990s.**

George Bush and a "Testy" Congress

Despite Vice President **GEORGE BUSH'S** convincing victory over Massachusetts Governor **MICHAEL DUKAKIS**, the November election ironically may have been a confirmation that the conservative hold on Congress has ended. As Bush moves into the White House this January, he cannot claim a mandate to continue President **RONALD REAGAN'S** conservative programs. In fact, since the election, Bush has distanced himself from the negative tenor and racial overtones of his campaign and embraced the theme of a "kinder, gentler nation." He will certainly need to bring a conciliatory olive branch to the 101st Congress which will be firmly controlled by the Democrats.

As the Bush administration grapples with the federal deficit and with pressing national problems in defense spending, health care, and foreign policy, it will have to deal with a Congress that has grown stronger and more assertive since the Democrats regained control of the Senate in 1986. Bush's victory, says Rep. **WILLIAM H. GRAY** (D-Pa.), involved "no landslide, no coattails and no agenda. He'll find a testy Congress which won't provide him with a long honeymoon."

Bush won't be able to dominate Congress as Reagan did in the beginning of his administration when he pushed through his budget which slashed social programs. Even among Republicans in Congress, Bush has gained little political leverage since he failed to carry on his coatails any additional GOP candidates to Capitol Hill. Nor does Bush have President Reagan's personal popularity which allowed him to go over the heads of House and Senate members and appeal directly to their constituents.

The 101st will also be a Congress where blacks continue to be a force in the House leadership. With his election to the chairmanship of the House Democratic Caucus, Gray has attained the fourth highest position in the House Democratic pecking order (see below). And black congressmen will retain chairs of six House committees and may gain the chairmanship of yet another. These committee chairmanships include: Education and Labor, **AUGUSTUS HAWKINS** (D-Calif.); District of Columbia, **RONALD DELLUMS (D-Calif.)**; Standards of Official Conduct, **JULIAN DIXON** (D-Calif.); Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, **LOUIS STOKES** (D-Ohio); Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, **CHARLES B. RANGEL** (D-N.Y.); and Select Committee on Hunger, **MICKEY LELAND** (D-Tex.). And Detroit congressman **JOHN CONYERS** should move up in seniority to head Government Operations as **JACK BROOKS** (D-Tex.) vacates the chairmanship of that Committee to assume the leadership of the Judiciary Committee from retiring Representative **PETER RODINO** (D-N.J.).

As in the past, black voters overwhelmingly backed Democrats for congressional seats nationwide.

Joint Center for Political Studies® • 1301 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. • Washington, D.C. 20004 • 202/626-3500

Black voters helped add to the ranks of the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) by supporting Newark's black city councilman **DONALD PAYNE**, now New Jersey's first black congressman. They also contributed to Democratic victories in senate races in New Jersey and Texas and provided the margin of victory in numerous other House races. **Most black voters rejected the opportunity to support black Republican candidates (two for the Senate and two for the House), all of whom ran on conservative issues.** A look at congressional races joined by black candidates follows.

Espy Trounces Opponent in Mississippi. The only incumbent member of the CBC who faced a serious challenge was black Mississippi freshman **MIKE ESPY.** Although his white opponent, **JACK COLEMAN,** resorted to smear tactics, Espy nonetheless trounced the attorney and former Washington, D.C.-based trade association lobbyist by a margin of 65-to-34 percent (a third candidate received 1 percent of the vote). Espy held his base of black voters in the 2nd Congressional District, a rural, low-income, 52-percent-black district located in the Mississippi Delta, receiving 97 percent of the black vote. **But he greatly expanded his support among the district's white voters, winning 40 percent of their vote. By contrast, Espy's narrow 52-to-48 percent victory in 1986 over former Republican congressman WEBB FRANKLIN included only about 10 percent of the white vote.**

The seeds of Espy's victory this November were sown long before the congressional campaign started. After his 1986 election, Espy lost no time promoting an important local industry, one which employs thousands of black constituents: catfish farming. He lobbied congress to pass "National Catfish Day" in 1987 and has used his expanding influence in Washington to persuade the Army to buy more of the regional specialty to serve in its mess halls. Espy also sponsored legislation to help develop the seven-state Lower Mississippi Delta region.

Challenger Coleman aped George Bush's strategy of polarizing the electorate by trying to cast Espy as an "unpatriotic left wing radical." As far as many whites were concerned, however, that dog just wouldn't hunt. Many of Espy's white constituents respect his businesslike style and value his assignment to the powerful Agriculture and Budget committees.

Payne Becomes New Jersey's First Black Congressman. Espy and his CBC colleagues will be joined in January by one new member. With his election in the 10th Congressional District, which is 58 percent black, Newark city councilman Donald M. Payne ends an eight-year quest to become the first black person ever to represent New Jersey in Congress. Payne breezed past black Republican **MICHAEL WEBB,** a vocational education specialist, with 84 precent of the vote. But Payne's road to Capitol Hill had been long and strewn with obstacles. **His attempts in 1980 and 1986 to unseat incumbent Peter Rodino in the Democratic primaries failed. But Rodino's decision earlier this year to retire after four decades in Congress, coupled with Payne's win in the primary over Rev. RALPH T. GRANT, a fellow councilmember, cleared all barriers to Payne's historic victory in the overwhelmingly Democratic district.**

Williams Loses Again in Louisiana. The election results were not so gratifying for **FAYE WILLIAMS.** In a near replay of her bid for Congress two years ago, Williams failed to unseat Republican House freshman **CLYDE C. HOLLOWAY** in Louisiana's 8th Congressional District. Williams' hopes of becoming the state's first black representative to Congress since **CHARLES NASH** (who served from 1875 to 1877) were dashed this year by Holloway's 57-to-43 percent win, which topped his 51-to-49 percent victory over Williams in 1986.

Holloway received more money this year from the national Republican party than he did two years ago, when the GOP practically wrote off his chances of winning in the 85-percent-Democratic district. Over the last two years he maintained his support among white rural conservative voters and became more visible among the folks back home by opening four offices in the district (including one in predominantly black East Baton Rouge Parish).

While Williams won a large portion of the 35-percent-black congressional district, she was unable to convince enough rural and blue-collar white voters to vote for a black woman.

Black GOP Candidates Get Little Support. Issues and political philosophy took precedence over race in the four contests where black Republicans competed for congressional seats but lost. Although each of them ran against a white Democratic opponent, none received much support from the black electorate. This was certainly true in Maryland, where former Assistant Secretary of State **ALAN KEYES** failed to unseat incumbent Democratic senator **PAUL SARBANES.** Keyes was an articulate candidate who ran an aggressive campaign that drew support from the Republican National Committee. Even President Reagan appeared at a fund-raiser for him. **But the weakness of the Maryland Republican party, coupled with his own lack of political experience, was a serious handicap for Keyes. Keyes did not help his cause by associating himself with a 6 million dollar campaign to repeal, by referendum, a state law limiting the manufacture and sale of handguns. The repeal campaign was sponsored by the National Rifle Association (NRA), and Keyes and the NRA sank together in most parts of the state.**

In fact, Keyes only out-polled Sarbanes in conservative, predominantly white Frederick County in sparsely populated western Maryland. But Keyes, who lost by a margin of 38 to 62, garnered little support in the large population centers of Baltimore City (20 percent) and Prince Georges County (30 percent) where most of the state's black population is concentrated.

Meanwhile, black Republican Senate candidate **MAURICE A. DAWKINS** fared poorly in his race against popular former Democratic governor **CHARLES S. ROBB** to represent Virginia in the Senate. Dawkins, who only received 29 percent of the vote statewide, ran a hapless campaign that proved an embarrassment to the GOP.

Dawkins' campaign began amid charges that he was distorting his earlier activities in past Republican party political campaigns, that he was misrepresenting himself by using the title "doctor" (he holds neither a medical degree nor a Ph.D.), and that his claim to be a registered lobbyist on Capitol Hill was false (there is no record of his having been registered). **Robb, on the other hand, had gained the respect of many black Virginians when as governor he appointed a black to the State Supreme Court and raised the state's spending on education to $1 billion. And Robb's Senate campaign manager, Bernard Craighead, was black.**

As cofounder and former chair of the Democratic Leadership Council, a group which is made up of elected Democratic leaders primarily from the South and the West, Robb brings with him to Washington a power base that extends well beyond the Senate. Indeed, his national connections and his rapid political ascendence over the last 10 years have led some observers to believe he has ambitions for the White House.

Elsewhere, two black GOP candidates for the House failed to topple incumbents — in Ohio and Wisconsin. **HELEN BARNHILL**, a management consultant and civic leader in Milwaukee, garnered just over a third of the ballots cast in her challenge of three-term Democratic incumbent **JIM MOODY** for his 5th Congressional seat. With 36 percent of the vote, she did better than many observers had expected since the district is only 22 percent black.

In his second attempt to knock off five-term congressman TONY HALL in Ohio's 3rd District, which encompasses Dayton, Republican RON CRUTCHER got only 23 percent of the vote. Assuming that he would win most of the black vote (the district is 18 percent black), Crutcher tried to appeal to white conservatives with rallies and endorsements in the district featuring Republican Senate minority leader **ROBERT DOLE** and **OLIVER NORTH,** who has been charged with masterminding the Iran-Contra scheme. That strategy was of no avail, however, in the 82-percent-Democratic district.

Gray Makes History in House Leadership Race

Pennsylvania congressman William H. Gray broke new political ground by winning a three-way race to become the first black Democratic Caucus chairman of the U.S. House of Representatives and the first black member of Congress to win a post among the House's top leadership. (Black New York congressman Charles Rangel ran unsuccessfully for House majority whip in 1987.) By gaining the Caucus chairmanship, the number four position in the House hierarchy [top House Democratic leaders are Speaker Jim Wright (D-Tex.), Majority Leader Tom Foley (D-Wash.), Majority Whip Tony Coelho (D-Calif.), then Gray], Gray expanded his already substantial power and influence. During his early years in Congress, he put his stamp on major legislation to impose sanctions against South Africa and expand minority business development. In 1985, as a relative unknown, he surprised much of official Washington by winning election to the chairmanship of the powerful House Budget Committee. During his two terms as chairman of that committee, Gray ironed out budget compromises that earned him the reputation of a coalition builder who could work with members from both parties as well as the House and Senate leadership.

In the contest for Caucus chair Gray again demonstrated his political skill by defeating two other Democrats, MARY ROSE OAKAR (D-Ohio), a vocal advocate of pay equity and other issues of special concern to women, and MIKE SYNAR (D-Okla.), who claimed support from a broad regional and ideological spectrum of House members. Some observers predicted a tight race between Gray and Oakar because Oakar was already Caucus vice chair. But it wasn't even close. Gray polled over half of all the Democrats, beating Oakar by 66 votes. Always the dark horse in the race, Synar only received about 13 percent of the votes cast.

Gray can be expected to restore an activist approach to his new post, in contrast to the performance of his predecessor, **RICHARD GEPHARDT** (D-Mo.), who spent much of his tenure as Caucus chair running for the Democratic presidential nomination. The Caucus is the forum of the House Democratic membership, and Gray plans to expand the influence of the body by holding regional conferences and ensuring that Caucus policy positions receive wide circulation in the media. The Caucus chairmanship is limited to two terms of two years each. While Gray will no longer direct a committee staff of 64 (his Caucus staff is only six) or preside over the development of a trillion-dollar federal budget, he sees his clout expanding, not diminishing. "Now I'm operating in a much broader universe, where I'm invovlved in developing Democratic party policy and strategy not only on budgets, but also on trade, defense, education—you name it," says Gray.

As his fortunes rise, Gray is more and more being discussed as someone who would look good on a national political ticket. But he shrugs off this talk, saying, "I'm an old ghetto basketball player—I take it one game at a time. Right now, I want to be the best Caucus chair the House has ever had. When I've finished with this position, I'll take a look at what else I might want to do."

A New Civil Rights Agenda?

In early December, Rep. **DON EDWARDS** (D-Calif.), chairman of the House Civil and Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, and Rep. **ROBERT KASTENMEIER** (D-Wisc.), also on the subcommittee, held a hearing on Capitol Hill to develop a civil rights agenda for the 1990s and beyond. The assembled panel of 13 civil rights scholars and activists explored the constitutional basis for eliminating social and economic inequities in the society found in unemployment, homelessness, and illiteracy. Edwards' belief that the nation must move to a new phase in civil rights policy was clear from his opening remarks. "The right to vote doesn't do a black or Hispanic person any good unless he or she has an eduaction, a job, and a home," he said. Edwards and others on the panel argued that the removal of civil rights barriers during the 1960s was not enough and that the time may have come to take the next step.

The focal point for the hearing was a 1986 Columbia University Law Review article by CHARLES L. BLACK JR., professor emeritus at Yale University Law School. American Civil Liberties Union legal director JOHN POWELL moderated the discussion, focusing on Black's contention that all American citizens have Constitutional rights to basic human needs such as food, shelter, education, and health care. Black states that these rights are rooted in the rights to "Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness" contained in the Declaration of Independence; in the government's responsibility to "promote the general Welfare" as stated in the Preamble to the Constitution; and in the Ninth Amendment, which reads, "The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

Rutgers University law professor **ARTHUR KINOY** forcefully asserted that "the thrust of the Bill of Rights and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was to protect the fundamental human dignity of every individual." He cited some of the earliest American legal precedents to make his point that the Constitution was designed to adapt to current needs and that it was the "affirmative duty" of the people to remake society so that it is responsive to those needs.

YALE RABIN, professor of planning at the University of Virginia, added that the original drafters of the Constitution held that ownership of property was a prerequisite for the right to vote. He concluded therefore that the basic economic well being of citizens is a prerequsite for political participation. Dr. **PERCY VAUGHN**, dean of the Alabama State University Business School, demanded that the discussion move beyond legal arguments and focus on human factors, such as economic empowerment, by creating wealth in poor communities through capital formation and business development. Historical precedents were cited concerning the government's taking special action to expand the economic power of private citizens. New York City education official **JUALYNNE DODSON** noted that after World War II, the G.I. Bill provided men (mostly white) returning home from the war with the educational equipment necessary to achieve their upward mobility.

Washington attorney GERSHON RATNER took exception to Charles Black's premise and asserted that, unlike the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence is not an independent source of law. He added that "the framers of the Constitution explicitly protected life, liberty, and property in the Constitution, but not happiness. The courts won't go for it." Other panel members saw serious obstacles to "renegotiating the social contract" through the courts. "Issues are so intractable today because the courts don't want to apply social engineering to modern problems," said NAACP Legal Defense and Education attorney **THEODORE SHAW.** Most participants concurred that the kinds of changes under discussion had the best chance of coming about through congressional—not judicial—action. It was also the general consensus that a significant public education campaign, including more hearings, must precede any legislative changes.

the participants to do so. And in Kansas City, Missouri, parents who received child care assistance reported income increases averaging about $2,000 per year. What's more, the state of Colorado found that providing child care assistance to help low-income families become self-sufficient costs only about 38 percent of what it costs to pay Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) and Medicaid benefits to families that remain dependent.

The ABC Alternative

The Act for Better Child Care (ABC), if passed, would upgrade the standards of safety and quality of care and give poor and middle-income parents more choices as they search for affordable day care. ABC would also free single mothers to take jobs and become more self-sufficient, and would give disadvantaged youngsters better preparation for success in school. The basic provisions of ABC follow.

- **Help Parents Pay for Child Care.** Under the legislation, the federal government would allocate money for child care to the states, which would in turn reduce child care costs for eligible participants either through grants or contracts with child care providers or by offering parents direct assistance based on need through child care vouchers.
- **Improve the Quality of Child Care.** The bill would create minimum national safety standards for child care providers receiving public funds and would strengthen states' enforcement of those standards.
- **Expand Child Care Availability.** The bill would provide money to help states offer grants and low-interest loans to start up new child care programs and expand existing ones. A portion of each state's funds could be used to recruit and train new family day care providers as well as to fund plans to lower the high turnover rate among child care staff.
- **Make Parental Choice a Reality Instead of a Slogan.** The bill would provide for consumer education programs to help parents make wise choices. Resource and referral systems and hot lines would be established to give parents additional child care information. And ABC would guarantee the right of parents to make unannounced visits to child care facilities.

The bill would also promote choice by ensuring a wide variety of private and public providers, including family day care, for-profit and nonprofit providers, and programs offered by employers, schools, and churches.

Churches operate a third of all day care centers in the country, and are therefore essential to currently available services. In many rural, inner city, and poor areas, churches are the principal provider of decent child care services. Under ABC, churches receiving public funds would be allowed to continue offering child care as long as their programs were nonsectarian and did not discriminate in their child admissions policies among children receiving ABC funds.

- **ABC's Funding Mechanisms.** Each state would have the option of administering child care programs through contracts with child care providers or through vouchers issued directly to families who could then exchange them for services. This would be one of the more appropriate uses for vouchers, which are already used in existing federal assistance programs, such as the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children, Food Stamps, and the recently enacted Family Support Act of 1988. In addition, more than 30 states currently use vouchers for child care as part of their own state-run child care programs. The federal Dependent Care Tax Credit, which is similar to a voucher approach, provides close to $4 billion to help families pay for child care that they choose.

It's Time for National Care and Safety Standards

In a national survey for the Children's Defense Fund last summer conducted by the Boston-based polling firm of Martilla & Kiley, Inc., 83 percent of working mothers said the federal government should establish minimum child care standards.

The idea that the federal government can help parents in this way is nothing new. For years, each branch of the military has had child care standards that apply to its base care facilities in all states. And the federal Head Start program has 165 performance standards that ensure the program's quality nationwide.

It should be noted that ABC would not interfere in any way with informal day care arrangements between neighbors or relatives. Family day care providers who wished to receive federal funds would have to meet certain requirements, but not the same ones that would apply to day care centers. ABC would require family day care to meet only minimal criteria regarding the number of children and infants served, health and safety protections, and a minimum age for care givers. These requirements should not discourage family day care providers from serving children.

It is good news that the Family Support Act of 1988 provides for child care assistance to parents receiving AFDC who are participating in education and work programs. But low-income families that do not receive AFDC benefits still need assistance. Recently, a working mother from California complained: "I am a single parent of two children, ages four and nine. . . . They are presently in a day care center, but I am months behind on my payments and have borrowed from every person I know. . . . Where can I get assistance? I do not want to quit and become another welfare dependent."

This mother and her children — and millions of Americans like them — need the Act for Better Child Care. America can no longer afford to ignore that need. ■

The Children's Defense Fund is a private nonprofit child advocacy organization that encourages preventive public and private investment in children and youth. For more information about the proposed ABC legislation, write the CDF at 122 C St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001, or call 202-628-8787.

FOCUS

Index to Volume 16
January to December 1988

Subject Index

	Month	Page
Black Elected Officials		
Gray Makes History in House Leadership Race	Nov.-Dec.	TL 3
Number of Black Elected Officials: Good and Bad News	Sept.	TL 1
A Salute to the CBC	Sept.	3
A Smoking Gun in the BEO Harassment Issue	Jan.	TL 3
The Black Family		
The Changing Black Family: Implications for Children	May	5
No Income Gains for Blacks	Oct.	5
Black Youth		
Black Youth Face an Uncertain Jobs Future	Apr.	6
The Changing Black Family: Implications for Children	May	5
Minorities in Engineering: A Model for Success	Mar.	6
Drugs		
Confronting the Drug Problem: Two Opinions	June	5
The War on Drugs: Do We Have a Winning Strategy?	June	3
What Can Be Done About the Drug Problem?	June	2
Education		
Minorities in Engineering: A Model for Success	Mar.	6
Election '88		
And Now the Shouting: The Delegate Selection Process	May	TL 2
Are Republicans Really Seeking the Black Vote in '88?	June	TL 1
Bentsen and Quayle Voting Records: Where They Differ	Aug.	TL 2
Black Democrats' Expanding Participation in 1988	July	2
Black Discontent at the 1988 Democratic Convention	July	TL 1
Black Leadership Meeting in New Jersey	Aug.	8
Black VIPs at the 1988 Democratic Convention	Mar.	TL 3
Blacks and the 1988 Democratic National Convention	July	7
Blacks and the 1988 Elections: Critical Choices	Feb.	3
Blacks and the 1988 Republican National Convention	Aug.	7
Blacks in the Often Forgotten Legislative Races	Oct.	TL 2
But Can the Democrats Take the Black Vote for Granted?	June	TL 3
Election '88 Update: It's All Over But the Shouting!	May	TL 1
George Bush and a "Testy" Congress	Nov.-Dec.	TL 1
The Glow of the Rainbow	Apr.	4
A Growing Black Vote: Dr. King's Legacy	Jan.	2
Iowa and New Hampshire: At Last, Some 'Real' Voters	Feb.	TL 1

	Month	Page
Jackson: First or Second in 27 States	Apr.	TL 2
The 1988 Election in Review	Nov.-Dec.	3
Not Voting: An Option Blacks Cannot Afford	Sept.	2
On the Presidential Campaign Trail . . .	Jan.	TL 1
On the Presidential Campaign Trail: The Republicans	Feb.	TL 2
One Last Look: Blacks and the '88 Presidential Race	Oct.	TL 1
The Other Black Presidential Candidate: Fulani's Quest	Mar.	TL 2
Record Number of Voting-Age Blacks in 1988	Feb.	TL 3
Scholarship, Research, and Black Political Empowerment	Apr.	2
Selecting a President in a Critical, But Complicated Election	Feb.	2
Super Tuesday and the Black Vote	Feb.	6
Tuesday, March 8, Was "Super" for Jesse Jackson	Mar.	TL 1
Voting Is an Exercise of Power	Oct.	2
Which Side Are You On: The Party Platforms	Sept.	TL 3
Women of Color Compete for Congressional Seats	July	TL 3
Employment		
Black Economic Progress: An Agenda for the 1990s	Sept.	5
Black Youth Face an Uncertain Jobs Future	Apr.	6
Minorities in Engineering: A Model for Success	Mar.	6
No Income Gains for Blacks	Oct.	5
Immigration		
Congress and Immigrants of the Future	Aug.	5
International Relations		
House Passes Tougher Sanctions Against South Africa	Aug.	TL 1
Japanese Racial Insensitivity—Again	July	TL 2
JCPS		
Black Economic Progress: An Agenda for the 1990s	Sept.	5
Black Leaders Gather at the Fifth National Policy Institute to Discuss Critical Policy Issues*	May	7
Blacks and the 1988 Democratic National Convention	July	7
Blacks and the 1988 Republican National Convention	Aug.	7
The Metropolitan Area Fact Book: A Statistical Portrait of Blacks and Whites in Urban America	Mar.	5
Scholarship, Research, and Black Political Empowerment	Apr.	2
Tom Bradley's Campaigns for Governor: The Dilemma of Race and Political Strategies	June	7
The Military		
After the Zero Option	Oct.	7
Focusing on Defense	May	2

	Month	Page
Truman and the Desegregation of the Military	May	3

Philanthropy

	Month	Page
Funding Candidates: Patterns of Political Giving	Aug.	3
A Tradition of Giving	Sept.	6

Race Relations, Civil Rights

	Month	Page
Civil Rights Restoration Act Finally Passes	Mar.	TL 3
Dr. Martin Luther King., Jr.: His Legacy Continues	Jan.	3
The Kerner Report: Twenty Years Later	Mar.	2
Looking Backward: The Kerner Commission Report Revisited	Apr.	TL 1
A New Civil Rights Agenda?	Nov.-Dec.	TL 4
On Black Initiative and Governmental Responsibility	Mar.	3
Scholarship, Research, and Black Political Empowerment	Apr.	2
The Supreme Court: Which Way on Civil Rights?	Oct.	3
Tom Bradley's Campaigns for Governor: The Dilemma of Race and Political Strategies	June	7
Truman and the Desegregation of the Military	May	3

Socioeconomic Status

	Month	Page
Black Economic Progress: An Agenda for the 1990s	Sept.	5
The Changing Black Family: Implications for Children	May	5
A Child Care Agenda for the 1990s	Nov.-Dec.	5
The Forgotten Poor: Blacks in Rural Areas	July	5
The Kerner Report: Twenty Years Later	Mar.	2
The Metropolitan Area Fact Book: A Statistical Portrait of Blacks and Whites in Urbun America	Mar.	5
No Income Gains for Blacks	Oct.	5
On Black Initiative and Governmental Responsibility	Mar.	3
Welfare: Dependency vs. Reform	July	3

Tributes

	Month	Page
Dr. Martin Luther King., Jr.: His Legacy Continues	Jan.	3
Remembering a Man Called Moses	Aug.	2
A Salute to the CBC	Sept.	3

Voting Rights

	Month	Page
Taking History to Court	Jan.	4
Voting Rights: The Fight Moves North	Jan	6

Author Index

Author	*Article*	*Month*	*Page*
Allen, Joyce E.	The Forgotten Poor: Blacks in Rural Areas	July	5
Allen, Joyce E., and Margaret C. Simms	No Income Gains for Blacks	Oct.	5
Carson, Emmett D.	Funding Candidates: Patterns of Political Giving	Aug.	3
DeFrancis, Marc	*After the Zero Option*	Oct.	7
	Blacks and the 1988 Democratic National Convention	July	7
	Blacks and the 1988 Republican National Convention	Aug.	7
	Tom Bradley's Campaigns for Governor: The Dilemma of Race and Political Strategies	June	7
Dorn, Edwin	Truman and the Desegregation of the Military	May	3
Edelman, Marian Wright	A Child Care Agenda for the 1990s	Nov.-Dec.	5
Featherman, Sandra	Voting Rights: The Fight Moves North	Jan.	6
Lightman, Don	Minorities in Engineering: A Model for Success	Mar.	6
	The War on Drugs: Do We Have a Winning Strategy?	June	3
McCrary, Peyton	Taking History to Court	Jan.	4
McFate, Katherine	Welfare: Dependency vs. Reform	July	3
Morris, Milton D.	Blacks and the 1988 Elections: Critical Choices	Feb.	3
Norton, Eleanor Holmes	On Black Initiative and Governmental Responsibility	Mar.	3
Owens, Russell	Black Leaders Gather at the Fifth National Policy Institute to Discuss Critical Policy Issues*	May	7
Parker, Frank R.	The Supreme Court: Which Way On Civil Rights?	Oct.	3
Phillips, Olivia	Congress and Immigrants of the Future	Aug.	5
Schmoke, Kurt L., and Rangel, Charles B.	Confronting the Drug Problem: Two Opinions	June	5
Simms, Margaret C.	Black Youth Face an Uncertain Jobs Future	Apr.	6
	The Changing Black Family: Implications for Children	May	5
Toliver, Constance	*The Metropolitan Area Fact Book: A Statistical Portrait of Blacks and Whites in Urban America*	March	5
Williams, Eddie N.	Perspective**		
	Scholarship, Research, and Black Political Empowerment	Apr.	2
Williams, Linda F.	The Glow of the Rainbow	Apr.	4
	The 1988 Election in Review	Nov.-Dec.	3
	Political TrendLetter**		
	A Salute to the CBC	Sept.	3
	Super Tuesday and the Black Vote	Feb.	6
Williams, Wayne K., Jr.	A Tradition of Giving	Sept.	6
Witherspoon, Roger	Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.: His Legacy Continues	Jan.	3

*Conference Report **Monthly Column TL - TrendLetter

The 1988 Election in Review

(Continued from page 3)

Furthermore, Bush was strongly criticized by black leaders for conducting a racist campaign when Willie Horton, a black furlough escapee from Massachusetts, was made the subject of ads designed to attack Michael Dukakis by suggesting that his state's prison furlough program was irresponsible. This subtle linking of blacks with crime echoed the rhetoric of the Reagan administration which associated blacks with unpopular social programs. Early in Reagan's first term, officials of his administration frequently referred to blacks who abused the "wasteful" welfare system.

Finally, there are few indications that the black vote ever became a high priority for Bush's 1988 campaign. According to one staffer at the Republican National Committee, the Republicans spent less than $200,000 (including staff salaries) on outreach to blacks while they spent $4 million on outreach to Hispanics.

Future Political Options

One can conclude from the election results that the overwhelming majority of blacks are not ready to desert the Democratic party and join the GOP. For all the Democratic party's reputed shortcomings, the great majority of those blacks who did cast ballots voted Democratic, and they did so in roughly the same proportions as during the 1984 elections.

The pattern of racial and ethnic voting that has emerged from the 1988 contest indicates that the Democrats can put a president in the White House only if they can form a new strategy based on a more balanced multiracial coalition. A two-tiered strategy could be adopted, targeting states that fall into two different categories. The first category would encompass large non-Southern states where the mobilization of urban black voters would be pivotal, including California, Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

States in the second category would be those outside the South where relatively few blacks live. Many of the states in this category have few electoral votes, but Dukakis either won or came close to winning in each of them. They include Pacific rim states Hawaii, Washington, and Oregon; Vermont, Maine, Rhode Island, and Connecticut in the Northeast; and Iowa, South Dakota, New Mexico, and Montana in the West.

This would indeed be a new approach for the Democratic party, because it would mean capturing electoral votes in states where there are few blacks and casting black voters in a pivotal role outside the South.

From the GOP's standpoint, Republicans must assess the viability of the Reagan coalition which has brought together conservatives, blue collar workers, and right wing ideologues. The big question is: can the GOP continue to win elections with the coalition as it is presently constituted or must the coalition go through an overhaul? If the Republican party decides to bring more blacks into its ranks, it must make itself less odious to black Americans. In order to lessen black disaffection, Bush must set a new tone through his appointments, policies, and official pronouncements. He must show blacks that they will benefit from his administration and that they are welcome in the Republican party. ■

FOCUS
Joint Center for
Political Studies®
1301 Pa. Ave., N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 626-3500

ADDRESS
CORRECTION
REQUESTED

NOTICE TO READERS: Please notify FOCUS of any change of address or title. YOU MUST ATTACH THE MAILING LABEL FROM THE BACK COVER when writing about service or change of address. No change can be made without this information. Allow 6 weeks for change of address to take effect. Thank you.

NON-PROFIT
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT No. 6958
Washington, D.C.

26063
SRI
Acquisitions Editor
Congressional Info Svc, Inc.
4520 East-West Hwy.
Bethesda, MD 20814

Postmaster: Form 3547 requested

RSGS-4
3/14/89

Volume 17, Nos. 1 & 2 January-February 1989

Special Combined Education Issue

FOCUS

The monthly magazine of the Joint Center for Political Studies®

Child Care: Building on What Works

Legislation Sponsored by the Chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee Calls for the Creative Use of Existing Programs

Reagan's Blind Eye to Civil Rights

Study Shows President Reagan Deliberately Abandoned Equal Opportunity in Higher Education and Recommends How to Repair the Damage

Closing the Technology Gap at Black Colleges

A Collaboration Between Ohio State and Central State Universities May Provide a Model for Computer Education at Historically Black Colleges

POLITICAL TRENDLETTER®

Perspective

ISSN 0740-0195

PRICE $1.50

Bush and Education: Much Must Be Done

Over the past year, George Bush, first as a political candidate and now as occupant of the White House, proclaimed that he would be an education president. If this is a sincere aspiration, he will be aided by a First Lady who has had a long and genuine interest in eradicating illiteracy. All of this is good because America is in the midst of an education crisis. And that crisis is felt more acutely by black Americans than the rest of the population.

The Department of Education estimates that there are between 17 and 21 million illiterate adults in this country between the ages of 18 and 65. And each year one million high school dropouts are added to that number. Black inner-city youths, many of whom are ill equipped to hold down any but the most menial types of employment, make up a disproportionate number of the illiterate and undereducated.

This is nothing new. It is a situation that certainly existed in 1981 when Ronald Reagan took office. But President Reagan's response was to cut back on college student financial aid and reduce our national investment in other education programs. And all this while Japan and Germany were outdistancing the United States in graduating engineers and specialists in the physical sciences.

Reagan's short-sightedness has cost the nation dearly. Investment in education is essential not only to secure our economic future but to preserve a meaningful democracy based on full citizen participation. Education is also key to resolving the debilitating social problems that face the nation today—drug abuse, crime, and teen pregnancy.

Myopia, however, was not President Reagan's only failing in the field of education policy. As University of Chicago professor Gary Orfield reports in this issue of *Focus*, the Reagan administration deliberately abandoned civil rights laws and court orders that had been designed to improve access to higher education by the nation's minorities.

Two other features on education in this special issue of *Focus* also touch on the nation's educational needs. Congressman Augustus Hawkins, chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, discusses his proposed Child Development and Education Act, which would add educational enrichment to child care programs. Another article reports on how Ohio State University is helping Central State University, a black institution, to establish its own academic program in the area computer imagery. Officials at both institutions are seeking ways to enhance the curriculums at other historically black colleges through similar partnerships in computer technology.

Education at all levels is vital to our national interest. We eagerly anticipate the policies, actions, and, we hope successes of the Bush administration. The new president must undo the damage of past policies and also work to revitalize programs of proven value. Much vision and leadership will be required of him if he is to prove himself worthy of his claim to be "the education president." ■

Eddie N. Williams

PRESIDENT

FOCUS Copyright © 1989 Joint Center for Political Studies, Inc.® The monthly magazine of the **Joint Center for Political Studies**, 1301 Pa. Ave., N.W., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20004 (202) 626-3500. The Joint Center for Political Studies is a national, nonprofit, tax-exempt institution that conducts research on public policy issues of special concern to black Americans and promotes informed and effective involvement of blacks in the governmental process. Founded in 1970, the Joint Center provides independent and nonpartisan analyses through research, publication, and outreach programs. Opinions expressed in signed *Focus* articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Joint Center for Political Studies. *Focus* is published monthly. $15.00 per year by JCPS, Inc.

PRESIDENT/Eddie N. Williams
VICE PRESIDENT/Eleanor Farrar
DIRECTOR OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT/Kathleen Vander Horst
DIRECTOR OF FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION/Brenda Watkins Noel
DIRECTOR OF INFORMATION RESOURCES/Auriel Pilgrim
DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH/Milton Morris
DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL POLICY INSTITUTE/Russell Owens

ASSOC. DIR. OF COMMUNICATIONS, PUBLICATIONS, MEDIA RELATIONS & PUBLIC AFFAIRS/Frank Dexter Brown
ASSOC. DIR. OF COMMUNICATIONS, ELECTRONIC PROGRAMS/Mark Lloyd
EDITOR, *Focus*/David C. Ruffin
SENIOR EDITOR/Marc DeFrancis
CONTRIBUTING EDITOR/Linda F. Williams
ASSOCIATE EDITOR/Constance B. Toliver
TRENDLETTER RESEARCHER/Alfred Baltimore
WORD PROCESSOR/Merlinda Ceniza Novicio

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Wendell Freeland/Attorney at Law, *Chairman*
Andrew F. Brimmer/Brimmer and Company, Inc., *Vice Chairman*
Louis E. Martin/Calmar Communications, *Treasurer*
Bishop John Hurst Adams/Senior Bishop, A.M.E. Church
Robert McCormick Adams/Smithsonian Institution
Norma Asnes/Writer
Hannah D. Atkins/Secretary of State, Oklahoma
Lucius J. Barker/Washington University
Charles U. Daly/John F. Kennedy Library and Museum
Mervyn Dymally/U.S. House of Representatives
Marian Wright Edelman/Children's Defense Fund
Luther Hilton Foster/Alexandria, Virginia
Charles V. Hamilton/Columbia University
Jayne Brumley Ikard
Bernard Rapoport/American Income Life Insurance Co.
Eddie N. Williams/Joint Center for Political Studies

Members Emeriti: William B. Boyd, Robert C. Maynard, James D. Wolfensohn

Eleanor Farrar/JCPS, *Secretary to the Board*

Reagan's Blind Eye to Civil Rights

Study Shows President Reagan Deliberately Abandoned Equal Opportunity in Higher Education and Recommends How to Repair the Damage

by Gary Orfield

Editor's Note: This article is based on the author's recent study of civil rights enforcement in higher education under the Reagan administration. A book based on the study will be published later this year by the Joint Center for Political Studies.

With the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the nation made a commitment to open the doors of higher education to all students regardless of their race or income. For a brief time thereafter, in the mid-1970s, a black high school graduate was about as likely as his white counterpart to enroll in college. However, as a result of policies instituted during the two presidential terms of Ronald Reagan, minority access to higher education has declined rapidly.

This occurred even while the number and percentage of black and Hispanic high school graduates were growing and their scores on college admissions tests were rising. Census data show that between 1977 and 1987, black and Hispanic graduation rates rose nine percentage points and two percentage points, respectively. Furthermore, black SAT scores rose 41 points during that period.

Despite these facts, the Reagan administration regrettably chose to reverse established, bipartisan policy by halting federal pressure to increase black access to higher education. With the Bush administration just establishing its own policy priorities, now is an opportune time to assess the damage and consider how the situation can be improved.

Reagan's Retreat From Enforcement

When the civil rights records of the Departments of Education and Justice during the Reagan era are closely examined, a clear pattern of neglect emerges. The Civil Rights Act, long regarded as basic to remedying discrimination in higher education, was not enforced. Washington ignored many states' retreat from the implementation of comprehensive civil rights plans for higher education. Indeed, the federal government publicly praised the "progress" of certain states in spite of documentation proving the contrary.

The way the Reagan White House chose to handle the civil rights cases it inherited from past administrations proved to be emblematic of the policies it would pursue in the area of higher education for minorities. One case from the Carter administration involved the threatened withdrawal of federal aid from the North Carolina state university system for its non-compliance with the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. In 1981, then-Secretary of Education Terrel H. Bell not only lifted the threat of a funding cutoff but allowed the university to comply with a far less demanding desegregation plan. Bell also expressed his "deep commitment to reducing the extent of federal intrusion in state affairs." Thus, a strong negative signal was sent to America's academic community early in the Reagan administration.

The administration reinforced this negative signal in its disposition of the *Adams v. Richardson* case. Initiated by civil right groups during the Nixon administration, the *Adams* decision of 1970 held that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (and now the Department of Education) must strictly enforce the Civil Rights Act in 10 southern and border states that maintained racially segregated public education systems. The states were required, by 1985, to upgrade instruction at historically black colleges, desegregate predominantly white schools, and integrate the faculties at all institutions in their systems.

Federal courts supervised the Education Department's Office for Civil Rights' (OCR) actions to ensure that the law was being enforced. The Reagan Justice Department, however, opposed the concept of federal court supervision of OCR. And Justice officials requested that the courts dismiss the *Adams* case on the technicality that the civil rights plaintiffs lacked standing, that is, that they were not the appropriate parties to bring the case to court. The Justice Department won a major victory in December 1987, when the federal District Court of the District of Columbia

(Continued on page 4)

Mr. Orfield is a professor of political science at The University of Chicago.

Reagan's Blind Eye to Civil Rights

(Continued from page 3)

concurred and dismissed the case. The plaintiffs are appealing that decision.

Devastating Initiatives

The Reagan administration's own initiatives on civil rights were equally devastating. In 1981, the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division went before the U.S. Supreme Court to ask that tax exemptions be granted to an openly discriminatory institution, Bob Jones University in South Carolina. And in the 1984 *Grove City v. Bell* case, Justice officials argued that civil rights requirements should be limited to individual programs within a school receiving federal funds rather than to the entire institution. Justice lost the Bob Jones case but won on *Grove City,* an outcome that crippled higher education enforcement until 1988. That year, Congress passed the Civil Rights Restoration Act over Reagan's veto, explicitly expanding coverage to entire institutions.

The administration viewed the use of federal power to achieve integration and equal access in higher education as inappropriate interference in the local operations of colleges. Accordingly, statistical evidence of backward movement was ignored in Washington, even as disparities between the college attendance rates of blacks and whites *grew* in several states. In Virginia, for example, the disparity in college-attendance rates between black and white high school graduates jumped from nine percent in 1978 to 21 percent in 1985. But the administration opposed any numerical remedies to discrimination, and criticized measurable goals for integration as "reverse discrimination."

Instead of pursuing vigorous enforcement, the administration assumed good faith and expected colleges and universities to voluntarily comply with the law. Washington even remained blind to the adoption of new state policies harmful to minority access. For example, achievement tests instituted in Florida and Georgia, which screen students who wish to transfer from community colleges to four-year schools, have had negative effects on black student enrollment. Complaints about such policies were either rejected or not acted upon in Washington.

The Triumph of Ideology Over Competence

The Reagan administration also cut back heavily on the resources available to enforce antidiscrimination laws. Between 1981 and 1987, the staff at the Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights was cut by one fourth, and the office's fiscal year 1987 budget, after adjusting for inflation, was 40 percent less than its 1980 appropriation. Surprisingly, even with these reductions, the office often *underspent* its budget and returned funds to the Treasury.

In confidential interviews, OCR staff members consistently reported that many of their professional coworkers had resigned from the agency after becoming demoralized by the tactics of Reagan appointees. Regional officials of OCR said they often spent their days filing reports to Washington which they knew would never be acted upon.

Top management of the agency tried to block public scrutiny of its operations. The current head of OCR, Assistant Secretary LeGree Daniels, refused to be interviewed for this study. Agency staff members were ordered not to provide information related to this research on threat of reprisal, and OCR even refused to respond to formal Freedom of Information Act requests. Much of the information for this study, therefore, had to be obtained in confidential meetings with current staff members, from documents obtained from Congress, and from OCR files subpoenaed by civil rights lawyers.

Recommendations

To build a comprehensive strategy for enforcing civil rights in the nation's institutions of higher learning, a number of basic steps need to be taken.

- The federal government must develop a clear set of civil rights standards and requirements for colleges and universities backed by a coherent strategy for enforcing them.
- The OCR needs to rebuild its battered staff and the agency must be provided with adequate funds.
- Enforcement agencies must seek the advice of professionals familiar with the inner workings of colleges and universities. The failure to understand how policies on admissions, faculty hiring, and curriculum are made and implemented has contributed to the failure of enforcement.
- The federal government must strengthen its data collection and monitoring capabilities and establish an effective system for quickly processing and using data on college enrollment and retention, faculty hiring, and other matters relevant to civil rights compliance.
- Finally, the federal government must adopt new procedures to assess the impact of major changes in federal or state policy on minority opportunities in higher education. This includes policy shifts in areas other than civil rights, such as the reduction of remedial programs at state universities and inadequate funding of recruitment and retention programs.

The retention by President Bush of a Hispanic former college president, Lauro F. Cavazos, as his Secretary of Education suggests that the new administration may be interested in changing the tenor of the federal role in education for minorities. Even so, it is vital that Congress use its oversight powers to hold Bush administration officials accountable for enforcing civil rights laws. Positive government action led to great strides in college access for minorities from the mid-1960s to the mid-1970s. And experience shows that with a new commitment to enforcement, the pattern of decline in educational opportunity can be reversed and great strides can be made again. ■

January-February 1989

JCPS

POLITICAL TRENDLETTER®

Inside This Issue

- Ron Brown becomes the first black chairman of the Democratic National Committee.
- Richmond's minority business set-aside program is struck down by the Supreme Court.
- George Bush's federal budget proposal sounds kind but might not be gentle to the poor.
- Across the Nation looks at coming elections in Georgia, Illinois, Michigan, Mississippi, and Virginia.

New DNC Chair—Ron Brown, the Negotiator

Widely recognized for his negotiating skills, RONALD BROWN, age 47, is the first black elected to chair a major political party in the United States. Brown won a heavily publicized race by acclamation when 404 members of the Democratic National Committee (DNC) met on February 10.

Replacing **PAUL KIRK** as the party chairman, Brown will primarily be responsible for helping Democrats win elections. He will oversee the whole structure of the DNC—media relations, state party organizations, candidate services, and most importantly, fundraising. He will also oversee activities relating to reapportionment and redistricting and will coordinate party operations in the 1990 and 1992 federal elections.

In his quest to become chair of the DNC, Brown, who describes himself as a "mainstream progressive Democrat," was supported by prominent party liberals, including Sen. **EDWARD KENNEDY** (Mass.), Gov. **MARIO CUOMO** (N.Y.), and 1988 presidential candidate **JESSE L. JACKSON.** This liberal support worries some party conservatives and moderates, especially those from the South, who fear it will move the party to the left. Brown has addressed this issue head on, declaring, "I accept this responsibility beholden to no individual, afraid of no faction, and pledged to no institution except the Democratic party and its members." While Brown's critics asserted that their concerns were not based on race but on political philosophy, the issue of race had been an undercurrent in the campaign for party chair. "I did not run on the basis of race," Brown says in response to this matter, "... but I will not run away from it."

Brown's selection as chair was guaranteed when his chief opponents, **RICHARD N. WIENER,** chairman of the Michigan Democratic party, and former representative **JIM JONES** (D-Okla.) both withdrew their candidacy before the selection meeting.

Brown is not new to politics. A lawyer and lobbyist, he began his public career in the National Urban League under the tutelage of WHITNEY YOUNG and VERNON JORDAN, later serving as the organization's Washington representative. Brown was deputy national campaign manager of Senator Kennedy's 1980 presidential primary campaign against JIMMY CARTER; he served as deputy chairman of the DNC from 1982 to 1985, and as national convention manager for Jesse Jackson in 1988. Since 1981, Brown has been a partner at Patton, Boggs, and Blow, one of Washington's most politically active law firms.

As chair of the DNC, Brown must hold together the traditionally fractious Democratic coalition. And he must help his party expand its slim majority in the U.S. Senate, make sure Democrats come out on top in the redistricting process after the 1990 census, and somehow improve on the party's one-for-six record since 1968 in campaigns for the White House. One of the first items on Brown's agenda is establishing a consensus on what the party *is*. "We, as a party, have to develop a clear definition of ourselves based on traditional Democratic values," he says, "but we must also focus on national defense, crime, and protecting our children from drugs."

Considered by even his critics to be well qualified for the position, Brown is viewed by various party factions as a polished negotiator. Says Brown, "I share the view that our party needs to reach out more effectively to all voters, and as chair my primary goal will be to serve as a unifying force within the party."

Joint Center for Political Studies® • 1301 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. • Washington, D.C. 20004 • 202/626-3500

Supreme Court Overturns Richmond's Minority Set-Aside Program

In a six-to-three decision, the United States Supreme Court dealt a blow in early February to minority business set-aside programs administered by state and local governments. In *City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co.*, the Court overturned a program that the city of Richmond, Virginia, had established in 1983 to remedy discrimination in municipal contracting. The Court decided that for the program to be lawful, it must be narrowly targeted to address proven discrimination within the Richmond area.

The plaintiff in the *Richmond* case was the Ohio-based J. A. Croson Company, the sole bidder for a contract to provide and install plumbing fixtures at the Richmond city jail. Richmond's set-aside plan required prime contractors to subcontract at least 30 percent of the dollar amount of each contract to minority business enterprises. The plan defined a minority business enterprise as a business from anywhere in the country that is at least 51 percent owned or controlled by persons who are black, Spanish speaking, Oriental, American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut.

The Croson Company requested a waiver from the 30 percent requirement, claiming that it could not find sufficient minority businesses to do the work. The city denied Croson's request, and Croson chose to sue the city. Federal district and appeals courts initially upheld the constitutionality of Richmond's set-aside ordinance, citing the Supreme Court's 1980 ruling in *Fullilove v. Klutznick*. In *Fullilove*, the Court had upheld a federal 10 percent minority set-aside law applying to federal public-works contracts, basing its decision on historical evidence of nationwide discrimination.

The Supreme Court agreed to review the case, but rather than making a ruling on its merits, sent the case back to the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals in July 1986. The lower court was instructed to reconsider the case in light of the high court's *Wygant v. Jackson Board of Education* decision that year. In the *Wygant* decision, the high court struck down a school district's affirmative action plan. On the basis of the *Wygant* case, the appeals court then reversed itself and in July 1987 ruled that the Richmond plan was unconstitutional. The Supreme Court affirmed the decision of the appeals court in its *Richmond* ruling this February.

Defenders of the Richmond plan pointed out that between 1978 and 1983, less than one percent of Richmond's prime construction contracts had been awarded to minority businesses, even though the city is 50 percent black. To justify the plan's constitutionality, they cited the *Fullilove* decision.

However, Justice **SANDRA DAY O'CONNOR**, writing for the majority, drew a distinction between the broad authority of the federal government to use set-asides as a remedy for societal discrimination, as applied in the Fullilove case, and the more limited authority in this area held by states and local governments. The Court has ruled that the federal government has discretion, under the 14th Amendment, to devise remedies in federal procurement programs for historical discrimination against a number of ethnic groups. Nevertheless, the Court majority stated that it is improper for localities to justify set-aside programs on the basis of societal discrimination. State and local governments, it argued, must only address actual discrimination in their own jurisdictions, and their remedies must be narrowly tailored. The Court noted that there was no evidence of past discrimination in Richmond against minorities other than blacks—such as Eskimos and Aleuts—who had been included in Richmond's plan. And the 30 percent requirement was rejected as a "rigid, numerical quota" which did not take into account the actual number of the area's minority construction contractors.

In the dissenting opinion, Justices **THURGOOD MARSHALL**, **WILLIAM BRENNAN**, and **HARRY BLACKMUN** called the majority opinion "a deliberate and giant step backward in the Court's affirmative action jurisprudence," and added that the decision "will inevitably discourage or prevent governmental entities, particularly states and localities, from acting to rectify the scourge of past discrimination." This, they argued, "is the harsh reality of the majority's decision, but it is not the Constitution's command."

As a result, all race-conscious state and local measures designed to redress discrimination will now be subjected to a rigid legal test when reviewed by a court. Approximately 36 states and over 200 local governments now have set-aside programs in place, involving hundreds of millions of dollars. In Washington, D.C., alone, over $200 million is contracted each year to minority businesses through the city's 35 percent set-aside program.

While the Court's decision narrows the standards under which set-asides can be implemented, civil rights advocates and minority business leaders are consoled by the fact that the Court did affirm the right of communities to implement set-aside programs generally—given the appropriate findings of past discrimination.

Meanwhile, in the aftermath of the *Richmond* decision, the cities of Seattle (Washington) and Lakeland (Florida), the state of Delaware, and the school board of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, have fully dismantled their set-aside programs. And in Massachusetts, the Fairview Construction Company has cited the *Richmond* case in its own lawsuit against the city of Boston for being denied a contract.

Minority business leaders insist that the stampede away from affirmative action in state and local procurement is uncalled for. "The wholesale dismantling of set-aside programs by some localities is unnecessary, unwise, and bad public policy," says Anthony W. Robinson, president of the Washington, D.C.-based Minority Business Legal Defense and Education Fund. "The issue now for municipalities is to examine how they can reform existing programs to conform to the guidelines of the Richmond case."

Bush's Budget—Hope or Deception?

When President GEORGE BUSH presented his fiscal year 1990 federal budget before a joint session of Congress on February 9, he certainly conveyed his "kinder and gentler" intentions. His budget message contained requests for new investments in education, child development, Medicaid, and housing, which even impressed Capitol Hill Democrats.

But some congressional critics see Bush's budget as holding out hollow hope. While they welcome his call for new spending in critical domestic programs, they resent the fact that Bush, by failing to spell out his spending priorities, has left to Congress the job of deciding where the sacrifices will be made. They assert that hidden in Bush's proposal to place a "flexible freeze" on spending are cuts in other important social programs. For example, freezing $136 billion in domestic programs at FY '89 levels without allowing for inflation and normal program growth would result in major fund reductions in such programs as the WIC (Women's, Infant and Children) supplementary nutrition program; compensatory education for disadvantaged students; and child welfare services. President Bush is also being charged, as RONALD REAGAN was, with basing his deficit projections on overly optimistic economic assumptions, underestimating the deficit by as much as $20 billion. (Bush figures the deficit at $95 billion, but the Congressional Budget Office sets the deficit at $115 billion given Bush's budget proposal). The following summary of selected programs in the president's proposal is based on an analysis by staff members of the House and Senate budget committees:

- **Education.** The president proposes a $411 million increase in budget authority over 1989, primarily for new education programs, which include a Presidential Merit School program, federal support for city magnet schools, a new awards program for teacher excellence, and a National Science Scholars program. He also includes funding for grants to states and school districts to develop alternative teacher certification programs and experiments in educational innovation, as well as endowment matching grants for historically black colleges and universities. However, vocational and adult education, compensatory education, and college student financial assistance would all be subject to funding reductions as part of the president's flexible freeze.
- **Child Care Tax Credit.** A refundable tax credit for child care has also been proposed, equal to 14 percent of parents' wages, for each child under age four up to a maximum of $1,000 per child for families with incomes below $13,000 in 1990. The maximum $1,000 credit would only be available to families with incomes between $7,150 and $8,000 a year.
- **Medicaid.** Bush proposes to mandate Medicaid coverage for mothers with infants and pregnant women living on incomes within 130 percent of the poverty level; he also proposes to provide free immunizations for children through age five whose families are food stamp recipients.
- **Medicare.** He proposes a $5 billion cut for Medicare in 1990. This reduction would be achieved by limiting the increase in payments to hospitals and physicians.
- **Housing and Homelessness Programs.** Bush proposes to fund an additional 109,000 housing starts through the Department of Housing and Urban Development, beginning in 1990 and continuing each year through 1994. He also proposes that the McKinney Homeless Assistance Act enacted in 1988 be funded at the authorized level of $746 million, which includes $676 million in discretionary funding. The budget also proposes a new $50 million initiative designed to reduce homelessness.
- **Social Security.** Bush proposes full funding of Social Security, including a cost-of-living allowance estimated at 3.6 percent for January 1990.
- **Anti-Drug-Abuse Programs.** The president requests $5.97 billion in budget authority for anti-drug-abuse programs in 1990, a net increase of $635 million over the proposed 1989 level. Drug prevention programs would be funded at $1.09 billion, up from $941 million in 1989; and drug treatment would be funded at $735 million, up from $621 million in 1989. Nevertheless, the Bush budget would significantly underfund the new authorizations provided in the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988.
- **Enterprise Zones.** Bush proposes a new enterprise zone initiative, which would provide selected federal employment and investment tax incentives to economically distressed areas. These incentives would be offered in conjunction with federal, state, and local regulatory relief. Up to 70 zones would be selected between 1990 and 1993. Over the four-year period, the estimated cost of the program would be $1.05 billion.

Across the Nation

An Overview of Coming Elections:

In preparation for 1989 and 1990 campaigns, "Across the Nation" will periodically feature election updates on mayoral, gubernatorial, and congressional races where blacks are potential candidates, or where the black vote may be decisive.

GEORGIA: To fill the mayoral seat that will be vacated by **ANDREW YOUNG,** who is statutorily limited to two terms, Atlantans are preparing for a hotly contested election this October 3. The main contenders are Fulton County Commissioner **MICHAEL LOMAX** and former Atlanta mayor **MAYNARD JACKSON,** now a managing partner of the Atlanta office of the Chicago-based law firm, Chapman and Cutler.

Jackson served two terms as Young's immediate predecessor, making history as the city's first black mayor. Lomax was elected to the county commission in 1978 and has served as commission chairman since 1981. Ironically, Lomax got his start in politics when Jackson appointed him in 1975 to be the city's first director of cultural affairs.

Although early polls reveal that Jackson is the odds-on favorite, some local observers are not willing to write Lomax off. Meanwhile, Young is expected to enter the state's gubernatorial race in 1990.

ILLINOIS: The death of Mayor **HAROLD WASHINGTON** in the first year of his second term has caused the city of Chicago to hold a special mayoral election this year. The primaries are on February 28 and the general election is on April 4. After much wrangling, the once crowded field of contenders for the Democratic mayoral nomination in this predominantly Democratic city has been reduced to two candidates—black incumbent mayor **EUGENE SAWYER,** elected to succeed Washington by the city council in December 1987; and Cook County state's attorney **RICHARD M. DALEY,** the son of deceased city boss **RICHARD J. DALEY.**

Alderman TIMOTHY EVANS, who had opposed Sawyer for mayor in the 1987 selection, has decided to sit out the primary and run as an independent in the general election. Evans, who is also black, is pinning his hopes on Daley winning the Democratic primary, thereby removing Sawyer from the race. This would allow Evans to attempt to capture Harold Washington's coalition, comprising blacks, Hispanics, and progressive whites. This will not be easy since Daley, who is leading in the polls, has worked hard to woo some of these same voters. The main GOP candidate is Herb Sohn, a physician who has run unsuccessfully for Congress.

MICHIGAN: In this year's November mayoral race in Detroit, **COLEMAN YOUNG,** with his already well-financed campaign, is expected to easily win reelection to a fifth term. His principal challenger for the Democratic nomination in the September 12 primary is businessman **TOM BARROWS,** who had received about one-third of the vote when he was defeated by Young in 1985. If Young wins reelection and completes his term, he will extend his record from 20 to 24 years as the longest-serving black mayor of a major U.S. city.

Democratic senator **CARL LEVIN** will be a prime target of the GOP in 1990. Michigan's Republican party will try to convince voters that Levin is too liberal to continue representing the state in Washington. He is indeed one of the most liberal members of the Senate. Levin was a strong supporter of the Civil Rights Restoration Act, and he has backed Rep. **RONALD DELLUMS'** bill calling for a total trade embargo against South Africa and the complete divestment of U.S. corporate holdings there. He is expected to receive the endorsements of civil rights organizations this year, as he did in both his previous election bids.

Several Republicans are considering running against Levin. They include three-term congressman PAUL B. HENRY from Grand Rapids, former astronaut JACK LOUSMA, who opposed Levin in 1984, and three-term congressman BILL SCHUETTE, who represents a rural district in the state's lower peninsula. The Republican party leaders consider Levin vulnerable. He beat Lousma by a slim 52-to-47 percent margin in 1984, and to date he has only raised $200,000. He raised $3 million in 1984, and his own staff believes he may have to double that figure to win in 1990. To repeat his 1984 victory next year, Levin will once again have to win a strong majority of the black vote.

MISSISSIPPI: **DALE DANKS,** the four-term incumbent mayor of Jackson, will face a black challenger for his seat in the Democratic primary on May 2. The challenger, state representative **CREDELL CALHOUN,** currently represents a predominantly black constituency in West Central Jackson. Calhoun, a former guidance counselor at Jackson State University, was once Danks' administrative assistant and has served in the legislature since 1979.

Calhoun has taken his campaign to the streets, making personal appearances at shopping malls and rallies. "He's a fighter," says **BILL SPELL JR.**, a campaign aide, adding that Calhoun was once a boxing coach for his company in the Marines.

Calhoun will not be Danks' only Democratic challenger. Freshman state representative KANE DITTO, who comes from an affluent white neighborhood of Jackson, will also take on the incumbent and has gotten an early start in fundraising.

Political observers expect a tight race among the contenders. There is growing sentiment among the citizens of Jackson that it may be time for a change. During Danks' administration, the city has experienced serious financial problems and has had to borrow to cover significant budget deficits.

In addition, Danks has begun to alienate many blacks who supported him in the past. For example, some black community leaders feel that he has dealt inadequately with incidents of police brutality in black neighborhoods. Nevertheless, although blacks are nearly a majority of Jackson's population, this may not prove decisive in the election, since only about one-third of the city's blacks are registered to vote. A primary run-off, if necessary, will be held on May 16.

VIRGINIA: Lieutenant Governor **DOUGLAS WILDER** is likely to be picked as the Democratic gubernatorial candidate without opposition at the party's convention in June. If he wins the general election, he will be the first black elected governor in the United States (P.B.S. Pinchback, the only black American to serve as governor, was actually appointed to be acting governor of Louisiana in 1873 and only served for 43 days.)

It remains unclear which Republican Wilder would face in the November election. U.S. representative **STAN PARRIS** of northern Virginia, former U.S. senator **PAUL TRIBLE,** and former attorney general **MARSHALL COLEMAN** (who ran for the office in 1981) are all vying for the GOP nomination. The Republican nominee will be chosen in a June 13 primary.

When Wilder was elected to the state senate in 1969, he became the first black legislator to serve in Richmond since Reconstruction. In 1985, after campaigning around the state in a borrowed station wagon, he was elected lieutenant governor with 51.8 percent of the vote. **Today, off to a strong start, he has already raised $1 million in his race for governor, and he projects that the campaign may eventually cost $5 million.**

Republican U.S. senator **JOHN WARNER** is heavily favored to win reelection in 1990, though he is expected to meet some opposition. Democratic congressman **RICK BOUCHER,** from the 9th District in southwest Virginia, is considered a potential candidate for the seat, as is incumbent Democratic governor **GERALD BALILES.** State law prohibits Baliles from running for a second term in the statehouse. If Baliles runs for the Senate, Boucher may decide to quit the contest. In both statewide races, Virginia's 18 percent black voting-age population will be a significant factor.

Closing the Technology Gap at Black Colleges

A Collaboration Between Ohio State and Central State Universities May Provide a Model for Computer Education at Historically Black Colleges

by Jack R. Marchbanks

The three dimensional image of a complex molecule is rotated on a computer screen. Within minutes, the researcher at the screen sifts through dozens of computer simulations of the molecule. Computer graphics allows him to eliminate hundreds of hypothetical molecular structures that won't be usable. The researcher, at the end of his labors, will have a manageable list of potential compounds that can be chemically synthesized and tested. He will also cut weeks or even months from the time it would have taken to synthesize the multiple structural variations of the molecule in a laboratory, and save perhaps millions of dollars.

Today, specialists skilled in computer graphics and computer-aided imagery are performing tasks like these in laboratories, universities, and high-tech firms across the country. Computer imagery is being used to design pharmaceuticals, to engineer buildings, to forecast natural disasters, and to search for cures for cancer and AIDS.

And while an increasing number of institutions of higher learning are training their students in the computer skills needed to pursue professions in this growing field, few historically black colleges and universities today are equipped to be among them. While eighty of the nation's universities offer two or more levels of computer graphics courses in art, architecture, and design, only two black institutions, Spelman College in Atlanta, Georgia, and Central State University in Wilberforce, Ohio, even offer an introductory course in the subject. And neither institution offers a degree major in the field.

Nevertheless, Central State is striving to narrow this technology gap. It has recently teamed up with Ohio State University in a creative partnership designed to establish a computer graphics curriculum at Central State. In addition to training Central State undergraduates, the partnership offers opportunities for graduate study and professional careers. Even though this collaboration is only in its genesis, its founders are already planning to replicate this model at other historically black colleges and universities.

A Unique Collaboration

In January, 1987, the Ohio State University Advanced Computing Center for Art and Design, a national leader in the field, agreed to assist Central State in the creation of its own academic program of computer graphics. To accomplish this goal, Ohio State committed to share its teaching expertise, specialized curriculum, and software.

"I see this partnership as an effective way to train more young people to take advantage of the new career opportunities brought on by the tremendous expansion of the computer graphics industry," says Professor Charles Csuri, the head of Ohio State's Advanced Computing Center and an internationally acclaimed pioneer in computer graphics.

Csuri's counterpart is Willis (Bing) Davis, Chairman of Central State's Art Department. Davis is directing that institution's effort to upgrade its curriculum and train its faculty to establish a free-standing course of instruction in computer graphics and imaging. Courses during this pioneering phase are offered in a workshop format. Next year, a formal academic program will be fashioned to address the university's needs discovered through this year's experience. Meanwhile, members of Central State's arts faculty are participating in a specially designed enrichment program at Ohio State which will enable them to assume responsibility for teaching the courses. Both universities benefit from this reciprocal relationship. Central State is developing a new computer graphics program while assisting with Ohio State's minority outreach by encouraging its own undergraduates to move on to the graduate program at Ohio State's design center.

Expanding Opportunities in a Growing Field

Careers for those trained in computer visual arts are growing annually in a variety of fields. For example, many of the printed and televised graphic and animated images in the United States are either computer-generated or computer-enhanced. But computer-aided imaging goes

(Continued on page 6)

Mr. Marchbanks serves as development consultant to Central State University.

Closing the Technology Gap

(Continued from page 5)

beyond simply serving as an illustrator's tool. The technique now has numerous applications in industry, science, medicine, architecture, and the military. Some examples follow:

- The design of automobile bodies and aircraft fuselages used to require expensive, time-consuming drafting and construction of full-sized three-dimensional models. Today, everything from space shuttles to sailboats is designed through less expensive and more precise computer modeling—in a fraction of the time.
- Technicians at the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colorado, are using supercomputers to predict how the burning of fossil fuels will increase the level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere and therefore contribute to the widely hypothesized "greenhouse" effect. With the computer's modeling programs, they are sketching a global map on which the areas projected to be warmer, cooler, wetter, and dryer under greenhouse conditions 30 to 50 years from now are vividly illustrated.
- Through the use of digital computer technology, two-dimensional satellite photographs can now be converted into three-dimensional terrain models. This technology enables Pentagon planners to rehearse air combat operations with flight simulators that recreate the surface features of actual locations.

Central State University's founding class in computer graphics has already begun to seek practical applications of newly learned imaging techniques. The school's fledgling Computing Center for the Arts is arranging to assist the University's Department of Manufacturing and Engineering in developing a mechanical hand for NASA needed to perform delicate and dangerous tasks in space. Similar collaborations with the departments of Computer Science, Mathematics, and Music, are also being planned.

The Computing Center's hard-won success, while substantial, is still not sufficient to ensure its future growth. It must capture corporate support if it is to succeed. Bing Davis is negotiating with one of the university's most successful alumni, Joshua Smith, CEO of the Maryland-based Maxima Corporation, to secure donations of additional microcomputers and a high-density visual display monitor for the computer graphics lab. Davis also plans to approach television stations and corporations in the Dayton area for the placement of Central State student interns in computer graphics positions.

Replicating the Model

After nearly two years of conceiving, planning, and getting the partnership under way, the principal figures from the two universities convened a meeting at Spelman College in August 1988 to explore ways to build similar partnerships at other institutions. In attendance were Csuri and Davis as well as representatives from other universities and from Pixar, a major computer graphics software and hardware manufacturer located in California.

VIC:TOR's Founders

The founding members of VIC:TOR who will participate in this summer's strategy conference on how to replicate computer graphics partnerships at other historically black institutions are listed below:

Professor Willis (Bing) Davis–Central State University

Professor Le Roi Porter–Central State University

Professor Charles Csuri–Ohio State University

Professor Thomas Linehan–Ohio State University

Professor Lev Mills–Spelman College

Professor Carl Latimore–Barry College

Mr. George Cagle, manager, customer support–Pixar

The group resolved to work toward eliminating the gap between large, wealthy universities and historically black institutions in all academic disciplines that utilize computer graphics. The group further agreed to develop approaches that other educational institutions, government, and the business community can use to expand educational opportunities for minorities in computer technologies.

Dubbing itself Visualization in Computing: Team Organized Resources (VIC:TOR), the group developed a set of principles to be followed in establishing new partnerships. The following are some of those principles:

- Computer graphics programs should be multidisciplinary and should service several academic departments.
- At the high school and undergraduate levels, educators and business people should stress the proliferating vocational, educational, and professional opportunities in the computer graphics field.
- To assist in the creation of self-sufficient computer graphics programs at historically black institutions, local corporations and major computer graphic firms must be willing to donate or sell at significantly subsidized prices the necessary computer hardware to institutions with limited financial resources.

To advance the goals of replicating the Central State-Ohio State partnership, VIC:TOR is planning a national visualization in computing conference aimed specifically at bringing representatives of 35 historically black institutions together with research, education, and corporate leaders. The conference will be held during the summer of 1989 on either the Central State University or the Ohio State University campus. It is hoped that the growth of computer graphics programs at historically black colleges nationwide will be among the fruits of the conference. ■

Gaye F. Banks, a librarian at the Franklin County (Ohio) Municipal Library, assisted with this article.

Child Care: Building on What Works

Legislation Sponsored by the Chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee Calls for the Creative Use of Existing Programs

by Rep. Augustus F. Hawkins

In the 100th Congress and during the 1988 political campaigns, child care became a visible national issue. Presidential hopefuls proposed programs, members of the House and Senate debated the merits of establishing a national child care policy, and promises were made to help the millions of working parents find decent, affordable care for their children. As we begin a new Congress and a new administration, the challenge to establish a bipartisan child care policy remains before us (see *Focus*, November-December 1988).

The lack of affordable child care options for working parents is an ongoing crisis, not only for single-parent families but even for households with two wage earners. Today, nearly 60 percent of women with children under the age of six have jobs outside the home, and many of them are single heads of households. Unfortunately, most newly created jobs are in the low-paying service sector, so the average weekly wage of women heading households is falling. And these wages are already inadequate to cover day care costs. Yet the median cost of quality child care for only one child is at least $3,000, an amount that would leave few single mothers with enough income to cover basic living costs.

Aware of these hardships for a large number of American families, and mindful of the fact that the work force of the future will consist largely of women, minorities, and immigrants, Congress is now moving to address the national child care crisis. Last year, more than 100 bills were introduced on child care (none were passed), and this year the House Committee on Education and Labor will be holding early hearings on the Child Development and Eduction Act (H.R.3), which I have sponsored. We expect Congress to take action on child care legislation this spring.

Tax Credits Aren't Enough

For the most part, the Child Development and Education Act would broaden existing law to make child care services available to more families with working parents. The Act would permit existing public educational facilities to be used more creatively and expand successful, cost-effective federal programs including Head Start.

The Act would target resources to the lowest-income families; increase the availability of day care options; offer businesses incentives to provide child care at or near the workplace; and establish minimum federal standards for the operation of care facilities.

This legislation contrasts sharply with President Bush's $1,000 child care tax-credit proposal. (See summary of Bush's budget proposal on page three of *TrendLetter*.) The Bush proposal would help few low-income working families to afford child care, since it would provide only about a third of the real cost of care. Further, the credit would only be available to families at the end of the year and not when they really need it. Nor would the credit expand the number of child care facilities in the country or improve standards.

A New Legislative Approach

The Child Development and Education Act contains three components. Each component would receive equal amounts of funding.

- **Expansion of Head Start.** The centerpiece of the Act is an expansion of the highly effective preschool education program, Head Start, with which the federal government as well as state and local agencies have had more than 20 years' experience. The Act would enable Head Start agencies to extend their programs to full-day operation, thereby helping to meet the needs of working parents of three- and four-year-olds. These programs would also be extended to run during the summer months, effectively transforming Head Start into a full-year educational/child care program.

Another goal is to insure that Head Start serves an expanded number of low-income working parents, while also making the program available to moderate-income families (earning up to $27,450) who would pay fees based on a sliding scale.

A study conducted by the University of North Carolina showed that developmentally enriched day care programs for children of low-income families, similar to Head Start, helped children adapt better to school, increased I.Q. scores, and lowered high school drop-out rates. And according to a 1985 report by the House Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, for every dollar invested in early childhood development programs, about five dollars are returned in social savings. Children who participate in such programs, the report noted, have improved self esteem, and as adults they will have better chances for employment and be less likely to resort to crime or require public assistance.

(Continued on page 8)

Rep. Hawkins is chairman of the Education and Labor Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Child Care

(Continued from page 7)

- **School Based Programs.** Millions of children, many of them very young, return home from school every day to empty houses. These youth, known as "latchkey children," are on their own until a parent gets home from work. After-school care is sometimes available, but its cost is usually well beyond the reach of low-income families. Demographic trends point to a huge rise in the population of school-age children into the 1990s. Already, there are about 15 million children ages six to nine in school, and most of them have mothers in the work force.

The Act would support before- and after- school programs for children of low-income working families. And, as with the expanded Head Start programs, children from moderate-income families would also be eligible to participate, for a sliding fee. These programs would be administered by state education agencies, the same governmental bodies responsible for the public school systems. Funds provided by the Act could be used to create child development programs and teacher training courses, and to build or renovate classrooms to handle the increased enrollment.

Recent studies show that after-school programs can relieve the distress of children who must otherwise stay by themselves after school, and can help reduce the pressures on parents of latchkey children stemming from work/family conflicts. Children attending after-school programs also show a considerable improvement in academic test scores and in self-esteem.

- **Infant and Toddler Programs.** There is evidence that the supply of day care providers for infants and toddlers is not keeping pace with demand. In some states, the state-legislated standards are weak, and in others the standards are not enforced. Few states have the resources to regulate and inspect child care facilities. The third section of the Act would provide grants to states so that they could contract out child care for infants and toddlers. Funds could also be made available for matching grants with corporations and foundations. Those agencies eligible to provide such services would include community-based organizations, both public and private (such as the YWCA and the Urban League), as well as individual family care providers. Once again, working families with incomes below the poverty level would receive free day care, while moderate-income families would be charged a sliding fee. Funds would be set aside to encourage businesses to provide employees with child care services on or near the job site. The growing number of women in the labor force with young children makes this an efficient use of resources.

Toward a Bipartisan Policy

The Child Development and Education Act was drafted to serve as one approach toward the development of a child care policy. I believe that by working closely with other members of Congress, representatives of the Bush administration, and state and local governments—as well as with citizens' groups—bipartisan legislation can be passed this year that would provide more child care services to children of low-income working families. ■

Aside from Congressman Hawkins' bill and President Bush's tax credit proposal, mentioned in this article, other major initiatives on child care include the "ABC" bills. The Act for Better Child Care (ABC) program, encompassed in H.R.30 and S.5, is being championed by Marian Wright Edelman, president of the Children's Defense Fund, and a coalition of child care advocates. The ABC approach is outlined in an article by Edelman published in the November-December issue of *Focus*.

FOCUS
Joint Center for
Political Studies®

1301 Pa. Ave., N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 626-3500

NOTICE TO READERS: Please notify FOCUS of any change of address or title. YOU MUST ATTACH THE MAILING LABEL FROM THE BACK COVER when writing about service or change of address. No change can be made without this information. Allow 6 weeks for change of address to take effect. Thank you.

NON-PROFIT
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT No. 6958
Washington, D.C.

ADDRESS
CORRECTION
REQUESTED

26063
SRI
Acquisitions Editor
Congressional Info Svc, Inc.
4520 East-West Hwy.
Bethesda, MD 20814

Postmaster: Form 3547 requested

P1-655-4

Volume 17, No. 3 **March 1989**

FOCUS

The monthly magazine of the Joint Center for Political Studies®

American Competitiveness: Seeing the Issue Clearly

To Expand U.S. Exports and Reduce the Trade Deficit, American Business Leaders Must Adjust to New Global Market Conditions and Reject Protectionism

The Price of Namibian Independence

As South Africa Prepares to Withdraw from Namibia, Some Observers Question Whether the Apartheid Regime's Domination Will End

Who Defends America? Race, Sex, and Class in the Armed Forces

Forthcoming Joint Center Publication Examines the Policy Implications of Black Overrepresentation in America's All-Volunteer Military Forces

POLITICAL TRENDLETTER®

Perspective

ISSN 0740-0195

PRICE $1.50

PERSPECTIVE

Blacks and International Affairs

Four important foreign policy subjects are covered in this issue of *Focus:* the return of Michael Manley as Jamaica's prime minister, the forthcoming Namibian independence, international trade, and national security. Each subject is a matter of concern to U.S. foreign policy and a matter of special interest to black Americans. Taken together, they help to make the point that the political concerns of Americans do not stop at the water's edge.

More and more voters are recognizing the direct and consequential links between international developments and their own domestic concerns. For example, unemployment, drug trafficking, and the trade deficit are all tied to developments beyond our shores. Thus, informed participation in the nation's governance now requires attention to foreign affairs. This is a compelling reason for all Americans to want to be better informed and more involved in this area.

The need for black Americans to become more involved in this field is especially acute, and it is one reason why the Joint Center has increased its programs and activities in international affairs. Commenting on our work recently, Congressman George Crockett (D-Mich.), chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs, said, "The Joint Center has brought clarity and insight to a wide range of foreign policy issues—international trade, arms control, the Caribbean Basin Initiative, and ethnocentrism, to name a few."

The results of our work are being presented in educational conferences, in publications, and in *Focus* articles. But, there still is much more that needs to be done to enhance the effectiveness of blacks in the field of foreign policy. One thing we must do is to continue to break down any remaining barriers to their participation in this field beyond African and Caribbean affairs. While the environment that spawned many of these barriers has changed considerably in recent years, some impediments remain even though they may be less visible today.

The lingering effects of racial discrimination probably underlie most of these impediments. For example, because blacks have had to devote a considerable amount of their time and political energy to winning and preserving their basic rights and to assuring their economic survival, they have had limited incentives and opportunities to get involved in foreign affairs. Moreover, blacks have been excluded from some international forums and have been harshly criticized for getting involved in some foreign policy issues. It is not surprising, therefore, that blacks have all too often been discouraged from preparing themselves to become effective participants in the international field.

But all this is changing rapidly, and both blacks and the nation are the beneficiaries of this change. In many areas today, in both the public and the private sectors, the political influence of blacks is being recognized and the demand for black international specialists is far greater than the supply. Thus, foreign affairs is an exciting new frontier for black Americans. ■

Eddie N. Williams

PRESIDENT

FOCUS Copyright © 1989 Joint Center for Political Studies, Inc.®

The monthly magazine of the **Joint Center for Political Studies,** 1301 Pa. Ave., N.W., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20004 (202) 626-3500. The Joint Center for Political Studies is a national, nonprofit, tax-exempt institution that conducts research on public policy issues of special concern to black Americans and promotes informed and effective involvement of blacks in the governmental process. Founded in 1970, the Joint Center provides independent and nonpartisan analyses through research, publication, and outreach programs. Opinions expressed in signed *Focus* articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Joint Center for Political Studies. *Focus* is published monthly. $15.00 per year by JCPS, Inc.

PRESIDENT/Eddie N. Williams
VICE PRESIDENT/Eleanor Farrar
DIRECTOR OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT/Kathleen Vander Horst
DIRECTOR OF FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION/Brenda Watkins Noel
DIRECTOR OF INFORMATION RESOURCES/Auriel Pilgrim
DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH/Milton Morris
DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL POLICY INSTITUTE/Russell Owens

ASSOC. DIR. OF COMMUNICATIONS, PUBLICATIONS, MEDIA RELATIONS & PUBLIC AFFAIRS/Frank Dexter Brown
ASSOC. DIR. OF COMMUNICATIONS, ELECTRONIC PROGRAMS/Mark Lloyd
EDITOR, *Focus*/David C. Ruffin
SENIOR EDITOR/Marc DeFrancis
CONTRIBUTING EDITOR/Linda F. Williams
PUBLIC AFFAIRS SPECIALIST/Deborah D. Davis
ASSOCIATE EDITOR/Constance B. Toliver
TRENDLETTER RESEARCHER/Alfred Baltimore
WORD PROCESSOR/Merlinda Caniza Novicio

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Wendell Freeland/Attorney at Law, *Chairman*
Andrew F. Brimmer/Brimmer and Company, Inc., *Vice Chairman*
Louis E. Martin/Calmar Communications, *Treasurer*
Bishop John Hurst Adams/Senior Bishop, A.M.E. Church
Robert McCormick Adams/Smithsonian Institution
Norma Asnes/Writer
Hannah D. Atkins/Secretary of State, Oklahoma
Lucius J. Barker/Washington University
George L. Brown/Grumman Corporation
Charles U. Daly/John F. Kennedy Library and Museum
Mervyn Dymally/U.S. House of Representatives
Marian Wright Edelman/Children's Defense Fund
Luther Hilton Foster/Alexandria, Virginia
Charles V. Hamilton/Columbia University
Jayne Brumley Ikard
Bernard Rapoport/American Income Life Insurance Co.
Eddie N. Williams/Joint Center for Political Studies

Members Emeriti: William B. Boyd, Robert C. Maynard, James D. Wolfensohn

Eleanor Farrar/JCPS, *Secretary to the Board*

American Competitiveness: Seeing the Issue Clearly

To Expand U.S. Exports and Reduce the Trade Deficit, American Business Leaders Must Adjust to New Global Market Conditions and Reject Protectionism

Michael J. Calhoun

The large and growing U.S. trade deficit is a real and present danger to the economic health of the nation. It has caused untold hardships for American workers who have seen their jobs exported overseas. It has lowered the standard of living for many Americans and helped to keep domestic interest rates higher than necessary. The deficit has even weakened the position of the United States as a world leader.

Although it is popular and politically expedient to blame other nations for this trade imbalance, in reality, most of the fault lies within the United States. Corporate managers are failing to adjust to fundamental changes in the marketplace. American consumers' habits of low saving and high consumption and the federal budget deficit have further combined to rob our industries of the capital needed to invest in new products and more efficient facilities.

There are solutions. But solutions will demand that policymakers and citizens alike move beyond simplistic visions and the quick fix of protectionism and look at the problem clearly and honestly.

The Problem Is Not There But Here

So far, the U.S. government has responded to the trade deficit by focusing on the behavior of our trading partners and on other external forces. U.S. trade policy has sought to solve the deficit by opening up markets overseas that have remained closed to American products and services and by restricting the access of foreign products to the American market. Beyond those measures, the U.S. has fought certain domestic practices of foreign governments, such as export subsidies, which allow their producers to sell at unfairly low prices.

Unfortunately, however, focusing on foreign practices addresses only a small portion of the trade problem. The consensus among trade experts both inside and outside government is that export subsidies and other practices by foreigners account for no more than 20 percent of the trade deficit. That leaves more than $100 billion of the trade deficit each year unaddressed by policy initiatives.

Furthermore, while trading conditions for exported U.S. goods and services have improved, this improvement has had little impact on the overall problem. American exports are nearly the least expensive they have been since the Second World War, U.S. labor costs are among the lowest of all western industrial nations', and prices of foreign-made products similar to those manufactured in the U.S. are steadily rising. Yet, in contrast to what conventional wisdom would predict, the huge trade deficit persists and is expected to continue.

Last year, U.S. exports lagged behind imports about $137 billion, one of the highest levels in America's history. And despite the fact that the 1988 trade deficit fell by $40 billion from the previous year, the trade deficit for the last quarter of 1988 was greater than the annual rate for the year. For January 1989, the deficit was slightly below the 1988 annual rate but, significantly, exports declined four percent. Few experts outside the Bush administration expect any significant improvement in the trade deficit this year; some think it could even worsen.

One World Marketplace

American producers are falling victim to foreign competition because they are failing to adjust to the ever-shrinking global marketplace, where goods from all over the world may be easily purchased by the average consumer. National borders are no longer effective in shielding producers from international competitive standards.

In the United States today, about two-thirds of domestic production faces foreign competition. The most dramatic example is the electronics industry. In the 1960s, several American firms were producing color televisions. During the 1970s, these firms all dropped out of that market, though since then one company, Zenith, has reemerged. Right now, several American companies are attempting to overcome Japanese dominance by trying to reenter the market with the introduction of high-definition televisions, commonly referred to as HDTVs.

(Continued on page 4)

Michael Calhoun is a partner with the Washington law firm of Laxalt, Washington, Perito and Dubuc and heads the firm's international trade practice. He was formerly vice chairman of the United States International Trade Commission.

American Competitiveness

(Continued from page 3)

American aircraft producers, small-appliance manufacturers, and computer software firms that fail to consider their foreign competition do so at great peril. Foreign corporations—primarily those from the Far East—are gaining ground in all these industries. The corporate community and the government must adjust to this freer market and resist the urge to build trade barriers. Such barriers only insulate domestic markets and discourage needed adjustments to the new global standards.

A large portion of U.S. products and services is regularly becoming standardized and, therefore, more easily produced by foreign companies seeking to move into the American market. To overcome this, U.S. producers must pursue greater product differentiation. That is, they must be able and willing to make frequent refinements in their products, at low cost, in response to the growing specialized requirements of a growing number of submarkets and market niches.

For instance, between 1960 and 1980, the long-established American shoe industry virtually disappeared when manufacturing processes and shoe styles became standardized. Manufacturers from the Far East were able to use this standardization to make American-style shoes cheaply, capturing a huge portion of the market from U.S. producers.

Fortunately, innovative product differentiation by some American firms in the 1980s has given the American shoe industry a rebirth. As styles began to change and variations in types of shoes grew, two American manufacturers, Rockport and Timberland, have been successfully serving relatively small market niches with their casual and active outdoor-wear shoes, respectively.

Even those companies doing business exclusively at home are not free from having to take global competitive standards into account. Most domestic producers must now assume that a foreign competitor is making a similar item at a competitive price. Their production and marketing strategies, therefore, must not only address changing domestic market demands but also anticipate the strategies and advantages of their foreign competitors.

Here again Timberland provides an example. In order to protect its market share in the U.S., the company is constantly refining its product and developing greater differentiation at even lower costs. In addition, Timberland, which originally sold exclusively in the United States, is now pursuing an aggressive export strategy. By seizing overseas markets, the company hopes to preempt overseas shoe manufacturers from gaining the product experience and success they would need to challenge Timberland in the United States.

A Problem in Management

Many American corporations have lost markets to foreign competitors because their managers have been insufficiently consumer-oriented, insufficiently attentive to detail in product design, and insufficiently responsive to special market needs. Too often they have seemed more interested in managing the balance sheet than the production floor.

In few places has this been more evident than in the automobile industry. By the late 1970s, Japanese car producers held 16 to 18 percent of the U.S. market, which was a commanding share of the only segment of the car market that was growing. U.S. producers had become vulnerable to Japanese imports because American cars had become a standardized product of mediocre quality. Detroit responded indifferently to the emerging submarket demand for smaller, more fuel-efficient cars.

Generally, Detroit's response was to ignore the challenge from the Japanese car industry and not compete in that market. Instead, U.S. auto makers sought protection from the federal government and, as a result, an agreement to establish "voluntary" import quotas was negotiated between the U.S. and Japan. The agreement failed to help American producers, however, since Japanese auto makers continued to meet the evolving demands of the growing market for smaller cars by offering more luxurious, slightly larger vehicles with better performance, higher quality, and better fuel efficiency.

American producers have still not responded adequately to the continuing differentiation of the automobile market in ways that could improve the trade deficit or their competitiveness. Ironically, in addition to protectionism, their response to niche demand has been not to provide their own products but to offer American brand-name cars manufactured in and imported from Japan and South Korea. The Dodge Colt, for example, is made by Mitsubishi in Japan, and the Pontiac Le Mans is now made by a Korean manufacturer. Indeed, the single largest component of the $54 billion trade deficit with Japan is automobiles, a substantial portion of which are imported by U.S. car manufacturers.

Run Away Consumerism

Excessive domestic consumption stands alongside management failure in preventing the United States from beating back foreign competition. Simply put, as a nation we spend too much. The U.S. has one of the lowest savings rates of any industrialized country. And the federal government, with its staggering budget deficit, is no better. The nation seems to have developed a preference for present reward over long-term benefits. If so, a significant cultural force may well be standing in the way of the structural economic adjustments needed to compete.

Furthermore, American habits of consumption are forcing the economy to allocate resources inefficiently, raising the cost of doing business for American companies. The habit of excessive consumer spending on credit prevents Americans from building sufficient capital savings to fuel economic growth. Consumer demands on the limited pool of capital, together with federal borrowing, has helped to drive up interest rates, in turn escalating the cost to companies of financing their investments in modernization and product development.

(Continued on page 8)

March 1989

POLITICAL TRENDLETTER®

Inside This Issue

- Michael Manley is back in as prime minister of Jamaica.
- Former Ku Klux Klan leader David Duke is elected to Louisiana legislature.
- *TL* presents a roll call of President Bush's early black selectees for federal departments and the White House.

Out Again—In Again: Manley Is Back in Jamaica

On February 13, MICHAEL MANLEY, age 64, was sworn in as prime minister of Jamaica for the fourth time in 21 years. Manley first replaced his father NORMAN MANLEY as prime minister in 1969; he was subsequently elected in 1972 and 1976, but lost to EDWARD SEAGA in 1980 in a hotly contested election that was marred by violence. This time around, Manley soundly defeated Seaga in a peaceful February 9 election by a 57 percent to 43 percent margin. Manley's new mandate to govern is even more clearly demonstrated by his party's parliamentary victory. His People's National Party (PNP) won 44 seats in the 60-seat parliament, while the opposition Jamaican Labor Party (JLP) won only 16 seats.

Seaga's defeat was precipitated, in part, by the austerity measures his government took to bolster the island nation's ailing economy. Seaga's policies relied heavily on loans and investments from the United States, the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund. This heavy burden of debt resulted in layoffs, a credit squeeze, monetary devaluations, and cutbacks in public spending. Although Seaga's economic philosophy paralleled **RONALD REAGAN'S** "trickle down" dogma—relying on the belief that a rising tide lifts all boats—the Jamaican economy simply did not grow fast enough to become the Caribbean model of capitalism Reagan had hoped to see.

University of West Indies-Kingston professor and pollster CARL STONE reports that while more-affluent Jamaicans credited Seaga with improving public utilities, reducing crime, and cleaning up the environment, their poorer countrymen felt that the Seaga government benefitted only the wealthy few. Stone notes, moreover, that lower-income Jamaicans gave Seaga failing marks for high taxes and high interest rates, deterioration in health and educational facilities, stagnation in the development of black-owned business, decline in small farming, and the acute shortage of affordable housing.

The disaster of Hurricane Gilbert in September 1988 only worsened economic conditions on the island. On the heels of Gilbert, Seaga promised for the first time during his term to allow massive spending for social programs. According to University of West Indies-Kingston political science professor **AGGREY BROWN,** the post-hurricane assistance at first resulted in rising public approval ratings for Seaga. The popular aid effort immediately preceded the election, but by election day Seaga's approval rating had again fallen and the call for a change of government returned in full force.

Manley faces similar economic challenges as he forms his new government. Jamaica must supplement revenues from tourism and its primary export, bauxite alumina, with new loans and investments from the United States as well as from other foreign governments and international development agencies. At the same time, Manley's government must honor the debts incurred during Seaga's tenure, and meet the high cost of petroleum and other essential imports while improving the nation's education and health services. Securing aid from the U.S. may require some political repositioning on Manley's part. His socialist image and close ties to Cuban president FIDEL CASTRO have made him unpopular in Washington in the past. But with a new administration in the White House, many observers believe that there is a good chance relations between the two nations will improve.

Joint Center for Political Studies® • 1301 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. • Washington, D.C. 20004 • 202/626-3500

David Duke and the Politics of Race

In a now well-publicized February 18 election, DAVID DUKE, former Imperial Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan and currently president of the National Association for the Advancement of White People, was elected to the Louisiana state legislature by a slim 227-vote margin. Duke, age 38, ran as a Republican in the 81st legislative district in Metairie, a 95 percent white suburban community just outside New Orleans. He defeated JOHN TREEN, age 62, a conservative Republican home builder once active in the anti-civil rights State's Rights Party. (Louisiana state law allows candidates from the same party to oppose each other in general elections.) Treen's brother, DAVID TREEN, was once governor of Louisiana.

Duke undoubtedly stands on the extreme of the nation's right wing. This is a man who called former New Orleans mayor **ERNEST "DUTCH" MORIAL** "a coon," a man who led a "posse" to the Mexican border to hunt down immigrants attempting to cross into the United States, a man whose present organization advocates cut-backs in black birth rates.

According to Dillard University sociologist **C. J. WILTZ**, Duke's victory was helped along not only by his racial outlook but by the concern of whites over joblessness stemming from the state's faltering economy as well as by general fears of increased taxes and demands for increased spending on welfare. While Duke won votes from every part of Metairie's white populace, Wiltz reports, these fears led to overwhelming white support among the poor and the working class. For these groups especially, Wiltz says, "Duke captured fear and harnessed it into votes."

GOP leaders were reported to be chagrined by Duke's registration as a Republican. (Duke, who ran for president as a Democrat in 1988, became a Republican three days before the filing deadline.) Republicans across the board endorsed Treen and renounced Duke, from President Bush's son, **JEB BUSH**, to Republican National Committee (RNC) chair **LEE ATWATER**. And shortly after Duke's election, the executive committee of the RNC approved a resolution condemning Duke, declaring that he "is not a Republican in gesture, deed or belief." The resolution denies Duke any financial aid or other assistance from the RNC and declares his views to be abhorrent.

Critics of the GOP have concluded, however, that the chickens had come home to roost. They assert that, beginning with BARRY GOLDWATER'S 1964 presidential campaign, the right wing of the Republican party had laid the groundwork for a Duke victory. RICHARD NIXON and Ronald Reagan both invited white voters opposed to civil rights progress to join the GOP. The Bush campaign whipped up racial fears with its ubiquitous WILLIE HORTON television ads. (Horton is a black Massachusetts prison inmate who committed violent crimes while on furlough.) And the issues Duke campaigned on—opposition to higher taxes, opposition to affirmative action, and opposition to welfare—are, after all, the same issues on which Reagan ran in 1980 and 1984.

Bush's Black Appointees: Do They Represent a New Vision?

The first thing **STEVE GLAUDE**, a prospective Bush appointee, told *TL* in an interview was that "Bush's new black appointments represent a new vision." Most leaders of traditional civil rights organizations are refraining from judgement, however, until the nature of this vision becomes more clear. A run-down of some of Bush's major confirmed and announced black nominees follows.

Appointed:

LOUIS SULLIVAN, Secretary of Health and Human Services. Sullivan earned his bachelor's degree from Morehouse College and his M.D. from Boston University. He specialized in internal medicine and hematology and taught at Harvard University, New Jersey College of Medicine, Boston University, and Morehouse College. Most recently he was president of the Morehouse School of Medicine. Sullivan was one of three black leaders to serve in then-vice president Bush's 12-member delegation to seven African countries in November 1982. Although his confirmation hearings were plagued by questions about his vacillating stand on abortion and his desire to receive sabbatical leave pay from Morehouse during his government tenure, Sullivan was confirmed by the Senate 98-to-1 on the first of March. The only opposing vote was cast by arch conservative JESSE HELMS (R-NC).

FREDERICK D. MCCLURE, Assistant to the President for Legislative Affairs. McClure has the difficult job of pushing President Bush's legislative initiatives through Congress. Ironically, McClure, once legislative director to former Texas senator JOHN TOWER, has had to share in an early defeat for the new administration when the Senate refused to confirm Tower as secretary of defense on March 9. McClure served as staff vice president for government affairs for Texas Air Corporation, as special assistant to President Reagan for legislative affairs, as associate deputy attorney general in the Justice Department under Reagan, and as a trial lawyer with the Houston law firm of Reynolds, Allen, and Cook.

WENDELL WILKIE GUNN, Chief of Staff, Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Gunn has served as vice president at Chase Manhattan Bank, as assistant treasurer of PepsiCo, and from 1982 to 1984 as special assistant to President Reagan for international trade policy. Most recently, he has operated his own financial management consulting firm of Gunn Associates in Stamford, Connecticut. He is a member of the Joint Center for Political Studies' Economic Policy Task Force.

JOE WATKINS, Associate Director in the White House Office of Public Liaison. Most recently, Watkins, an ordained minister, was an assistant to the president of the University of Pennsylvania, and before that an assistant to **DAN QUAYLE** for three years when Quayle was in the U.S. Senate. In 1986 GOP candidate Watkins lost to popular Democratic incumbent **ANDY JACOBS** in a bid for Congress from Indiana's 10th district, which includes Indianapolis.

ANNA PEREZ, First Lady's Press Secretary. Perez has been a press aide to Sen. Slade Gorton and most recently Rep. **JOHN MILLER**, both Republicans from Washington State. A native of New York City, she once published with her husband *Tacoma Facts*, a community newspaper in the state of Washington.

JOSEPH PERKINS, Deputy Assistant for Domestic Policy, Office of the Vice President. Perkins has been an editorial writer at the *Wall Street Journal* for four and a half years. A graduate of Howard University's School of Communications, Perkins made a name for himself by writing conservative editorial pieces at the *Journal*. In a controversial article published in *Policy Review* magazine, "Boom Time for Black America: The Middle Class Is Surging Under Reagan," Perkins asserted that the black middle class has thrived because of Reagan's policies. *Policy Review* is a publication of the Heritage Foundation, a conservative research institution in Washington, D.C.

Nominated, Confirmation Pending:

WILLIAM LUCAS, Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights. A former Democratic Wayne County (Detroit) executive, Lucas became a Republican in 1986 when he ran, unsuccessfully, for the governorship of Michigan against incumbent Democrat **JAMES BLANCHARD.** As county executive and as Wayne County Sheriff before that, Lucas received overwhelming support from black voters. When he ran as the GOP gubernatorial nominee with the backing of Ronald Reagan, however, his campaign was vigorously opposed by Detroit congressman **JOHN CONYERS,** mayor **COLEMAN YOUNG,** and other prominent black Democrats in the state, and he received scant support from black voters.

Lucas's connection to the Reagan agenda and his lack of experience in civil rights enforcement have made him Bush's most controversial black nominee thus far. Few civil rights advocates are pleased with Lucas's nomination. "We had hoped that the attorney general would have tried to pick someone who had some experience with civil rights litigation," says JULIUS CHAMBERS, director-counsel of the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund. And RALPH NEAS, executive director of the Washington-based Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, expressed his disappointment that Lucas "does not have a very strong background in civil rights. The assistant attorney general for civil rights is a very important position, not one for on-the-job training." (WILLIAM BRADFORD REYNOLDS, who headed the Civil Rights Division during the Reagan administration, attempted to use his position to undo many of the civil right gains secured in the 1960s and 1970s.)

CONSTANCE "CONNIE" NEWMAN, Director of the Office of Personnel Management. Newman has had 20 years of public affairs experience. Policymaking posts she has held in Washington include director of Volunteers In Service To America (VISTA) from 1971 to 1973, commissioner and vice chair of the Consumer Products Safety Commission from 1973 to 1976, and assistant secretary for regulatory programs at the Department of Housing and Urban Development from 1976 to 1977. She also served on Bush's presidential transition team as director of outreach and was instrumental in the selection of several blacks for posts in the Bush administration.

JEWEL LAFONTANT, Assistant Secretary of State for Refugee Affairs. Lafontant is senior partner in the Chicago law firm of Vedder, Price, Kaufman, and Kammholz. She was formerly Deputy Solicitor General in the U.S. Justice Department during the Nixon administration. In addition, she served as U.S. Representative to the United Nations and has been named to several boards and commissions of the federal government. Lafontant is remembered most recently for testifying on behalf of Judge **ROBERT BORK**, who was nominated by Reagan, but not confirmed, to be a justice on the Supreme Court.

STEVE GLAUDE, Deputy Secretary of HUD. Glaude's most recent position has been as director of the National Association of Neighborhoods, an organization involved in improving the conditions of poor neighborhoods. He also was chairman of the board of the Capitol East Children's Center, a day-care facility in Washington, D.C., and has worked for the D.C. Association for Retarded Citizens.

TL will continue to publish the names of Bush nominees and appointees in future issues.

Across the Nation

GEORGIA: On the heels of the U.S. Supreme Court's February decision to strike down the city of Richmond's minority business set-aside program in *City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co.*, Georgia's state supreme court has overturned a similar program in Atlanta. The city had established a goal of 35 percent participation for blacks, Hispanics, native Americans, and Asians in all city contracts valued over $25,000. In 1973, contractors from minority groups held a total of only $40,000 worth of city contracts, less than one percent of the city's $29 million total, whereas by 1987, the minority figure was $29 million, 36.7 percent of an $80 million total, according to the city's Office of Contract Compliance.

As in the *Richmond* case, Georgia's high court stopped short of deciding that such racially based efforts to broaden minority contract participation were unconstitutional or that they violated the state's own equal protection statute. The Georgia court did rule that set-aside programs will be held to a "strict scrutiny standard." Applying that standard, it determined that Atlanta officials did not produce convincing evidence of discrimination to justify their program. The court added that Atlanta had failed to create a program narrowly tailored to eliminating the present effects of past discrimination.

In the aftermath of the Georgia decision, the first major projects that may be affected are the construction of a $7 million municipal court building and a $210 million domed stadium to be built in Atlanta with state, city, and county funds. Clearly, the effects of the *Richmond* decision are only beginning to be felt.

NEW YORK: Manhattan borough president DAVID DINKINS, 61, the city's highest-ranking black official, announced his candidacy for mayor of New York in mid-February. Dinkins, who is running on the promise of uniting the sharply polarized city, is trying to gather a coalition of blacks, Hispanics, municipal union leaders, and white liberals. His Democratic primary opposition includes incumbent Mayor **EDWARD KOCH** and City Comptroller **HARRISON GOLDIN**, and may also include former chairman of the Metropolitan Transportation Authority **RICHARD RAVITCH**, a liberal. For Dinkins, it might be best if Ravitch decides not to run, since the two are likely to appeal to many of the same voters.

On the Republican side, the two chief candidates are former U.S. attorney **RUDOLPH GIULIANI** and **RONALD S. LAUDER**, the Estee Lauder heir who served as U.S. ambassador to Austria during the Reagan administration. Both primary elections will be held September 12.

Most pundits expect the Democratic primary to be tough and nasty. Dinkins, who has been a state legislator, city clerk, and Board of Elections president, has the reputation of a gentlemanly politician, but already he has said he is prepared to deal with whatever Koch or any other opponent throws his way. Koch is known to be a street fighter who often uses racial polarization to his advantage—for example, in the 1988 New York presidential primary launched vicious personal attacks against Jesse Jackson, and generally exacerbated black-Jewish relations in the Big Apple. **While early public opinion polls give Dinkins the lead in the Democratic field, his chances will depend heavily on black voter turnout. Jesse Jackson was able to draw large black turnouts in his 1984 and 1988 campaigns for the Democratic presidential nomination, but voter registration among blacks in New York nevertheless remains abysmally low. Increasing black voter registration will undoubtedly be one of Dinkins' first goals.**

Winning the primary, however, will not guarantee Dinkins the mayor's office. Millionaire Lauder, by far the best financed candidate, says he plans to spend as much as $10 million of his own money on the race, bypassing a new city law limiting spending for candidates who accept public financing to $3 million in the primary and $3 million in the general election. Lauder is backed by U.S. Senator **ALFONSE D'AMATO** of New York, who has long feuded with Guiliani. **Guiliani, however, is presently favored in the Republican contest, and some observers conclude that it might be even more difficult for Dinkins to defeat him in the general election than to defeat Koch in the primary.**

CONGRESSIONAL UPDATE:

CBC and MPs to Meet

Since their unprecedented election to Britain's 523-member House of Commons in 1987, three black members of parliament, DIANE ABBOT, KEITH VAZ, and BERNIE GRANT, all members of the Labor Party, have formed the first Parliamentary Black Caucus. (LORD PITT of the House of Lords is also a member of the new Caucus.) The British legislators are building close ties with the U.S. Congressional Black Caucus (CBC), based on what Abbott calls "a deep sense of the collective history of the African diaspora."

The Parliamentary Black Caucus has invited the members of the CBC to join them for their historic installation ceremonies from March 30 to April 2. A conference will also be held, attended by other black British elected officials. Other U.S. invitees include Joint Center president **EDDIE N. WILLIAMS**, **RUSSELL OWENS**, director of the JCPS National Policy Institute, and the heads of all national organizations of black American elected officials.

Congress Pushes Minimum Wage Increase

After spending a great deal of time debating an unsuccessful 50 percent salary increase for its members, Congress has finally gotten around to legislation to raise the minimum wage ($3.35 per hour) for low-income workers. EDWARD M. KENNEDY (D-Mass.), chairman of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, and AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS (D-Cal), chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, are both pushing bills (S.4 and H.R.2, respectively) that would raise the minimum wage to $4.65 an hour by 1992. The wage would rise incrementally—to $3.85 an hour by January 1, 1990, $4.25 an hour by January 1, 1991, and $4.65 by January 1, 1992. Many officials from organized labor contend that the increase is long overdue, since Ronald Reagan held the wage to $3.35 an hour for the entire eight years he was in office.

Kennedy's bill cleared his committee by a vote of 11-to-5 on March 8, with two Republicans, senators **DAVID F. DURENBERGER** (R-Minn.) and **JAMES M. JEFFORDS** (R-Vt.), joining the Democrats in support of it. On March 14, Hawkins' committee approved a companion bill, whose main provisions differ little from the Senate measure but would extend coverage to employees of the House of Representatives. Both bills would exempt small firms with annual sales of $500,000 or less.

The bills could hit a snag if President Bush insists on his proposal to hold the wage down to $4.25 an hour. The Bush proposal also would institute, for the first time ever, a six-month "training wage" of $3.35 an hour that employers would be allowed to pay new workers. However, the administration has not proposed a mechanism to raise the training wage in the future.

The Price of Namibian Independence

As South Africa Prepares to Withdraw from Namibia, Some Observers Question Whether the Apartheid Regime's Domination Will End

by Henry J. Richardson, III and Lisa Peterson

After years of suffering under the illegal, oppressive rule of South Africa's apartheid regime, the people of the southern African territory of Namibia are beginning to prepare for the first free and fair elections in their history. This day has been long in coming. For over 100 years, the Namibian people have languished under white-minority rule—first under the Germans, who colonized the territory in 1884 and controlled it until the First World War, and for the past 73 years under South Africa's occupation, illegal since 1966. Thus, the independence of Namibia will be a historic event: indeed, once Namibia is free, the Republic of South Africa will remain the only African nation governed by a white minority.

In spite of widespread relief following South Africa's recent decision to end its occupation, the news has been greeted with mixed reactions by both Namibians and opponents of apartheid worldwide. Many question whether the recently signed Tripartite Agreement between South Africa, Angola, and Cuba can actually be carried out, and whether the political price for reaching the agreement was pushed too high.

This speculation is due to South Africa's long history of internal repression, regional destabilization, and violation of regional peace treaties. Some observers question whether the United Nations can manage to ensure fair elections in Namibia and oversee the nation's emergence into independence. (Under international law and the terms of the agreement [see box, page 6], the United Nations is recognized as the guarantor of the Namibian people's right to genuine independence under the international legal principles of self-determination.) Furthermore, even if elections are held, a constitution drafted, a government formed, and political independence achieved, many observers are concerned that Namibia may remain too economically dependent on South Africa.

A Rocky Road to Liberation

The road to Namibian independence has been a long and rocky one. Those seeking a free Namibia have long been frustrated by Pretoria's campaign to destroy the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the Namibian liberation movement that has been waging armed struggle for 23 years. They have been frustrated as well by resistance from Washington, particularly during the years of the Reagan administration.

Those who have long sought independence for Namibia—including the black-ruled nations bordering South Africa (known as the Frontline States), the Organization of African Unity (OAU), and anti-apartheid forces worldwide—argue that the nation's liberation is important not only because of its people's right to end their colonial status, but also because of its strategic importance. It is from military bases in Namibia, for example, that South Africa has launched most of its attacks on the neighboring states of Zambia, Zimbabwe, and Angola.

Frustration over Namibia's long-delayed independence dates back to 1978, when Resolution 435, which formed the basis of the Tripartite Agreement, was first adopted by the United Nations Security Council. At that time, every member of the council, including the U.S. (then under the Carter administration), agreed to the terms of the resolution, along with SWAPO. South Africa, however, only agreed "in principle," refusing to allow its implementation. In 1981, a decision reached by the Reagan administration and then by South Africa, linking Namibian independence to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, gave Pretoria another convenient excuse to block the resolution's implementation altogether. It wasn't until Angolan and Cuban forces made major military advances against South African occupation forces in Angola last year that the apartheid regime was again forced to negotiate.

The Price of Independence

The Tripartite Agreement has been signed at the expense of the Frontline States' attempts at autonomy from South Africa and at the expense of the effectiveness of anti-apartheid forces throughout the region. The U.S. and South Africa, with the participation of the Soviet Union, sought and won as part of the agreement the closure of seven African National Congress training camps in Angola, a provision that may infringe upon Angola's duty to shelter South African refugees under international law. Soviet involvement in this entire agreement signals a major shift in Soviet policy toward accomodation with Pretoria and Washington while moving away from previous unequivocal support for the Frontline States and African liberation movements.

Further, the Tripartite Agreement exploits the principles

(Continued on page 6)

Henry J. Richardson, III is Professor of Law at Temple University and International Scholar at the Joint Center for Political Studies for 1988-1989. Lisa Peterson interned at the Joint Center for Political Studies in 1988. She will receive her B.A. in International Relations from Georgetown University in 1989.

The Price of Namibian Independence

(Continued from page 5)

of "inviolability of borders" and "non-interference in the internal affairs of states" in order to shield the apartheid regime from outside pressure. It is worth noting that apartheid has been designated a criminal system under international law; the South African regime's involvement in the Tripartite Agreement has therefore given it implicit approval and protection, contrary to international law.

A final barrier to genuine independence emerged shortly after the agreement was signed. Reagan and then Bush administration officials demanded at the last minute that the size of the U.N. peacekeeping force in Namibia be reduced from 9,000 persons to 3,000. This reduction was needed, the administration claimed, to cut the operation's price tag from $600 million to $450 million.

The Permanent Member nations of the U.N. Security Council agreed to this cut and stood fast against the objections not only of SWAPO but of foreign ministers from the entire U.N. African group and those of many other third world states. These opponents of apartheid argued that the reduced force would not be large enough to effectively monitor the elections and the borders, prevent intimidation by the South African-controlled Namibian police, and perform other critical duties. The dispute was then referred to the U.N. Secretary General, who fixed the agreed-upon size of the peacekeeping force at 4,500, a decision then adopted by the Security Council.

The danger now exists that the United Nations in Namibia may be reduced to a mere caretaker of schedules and a bystander to political events manipulated by Pretoria. There is evidence that South Africa plans to defraud the election by stacking the ballots with 40,000 false voter registration certificates. These false certificates, it has been reported, would be provided to members of UNITA, the Angolan rebel group armed and financed by the U.S. and South Africa, and to South African blacks collaborating with the regime and infiltrated into Namibia. In addition, Pretoria is reported to be forming a group of dissident Namibians to oppose SWAPO and further sabotage the election process. If these schemes do not unfold and the elections are held fairly, most international experts agree, SWAPO officials are widely expected to win a majority.

A mineral-rich country, which produces much of the world's diamonds and uranium, Namibia even with its independence will remain encumbered by severe economic dependence on South Africa. Its diamond and uranium mines today are controlled by multinational firms based either in South Africa or western industrial nations. Furthermore, Namibia will still need imported South African foodstuffs and manufactured goods as well as rail transportation. It will also have to depend on South Africa's direct government support, including South African officials temporarily loaned to the new Namibian administration. Dependence will be further intensified by South Africa's continued control of Walvis Bay, Namibia's only deepwater port. To date, South Africa has refused to relinquish control of the port, in violation of a separate U.N. Security Council resolution. The issue of Walvis Bay is not addressed either in the Tripartite Agreement or in U.N. Resolution 435.

Opportunity for a New U.S. Policy

The overarching question for American citizens is whether their government will continue the Reagan administration's policy of weakening the resources of the U.N. and allowing South Africa to undermine the process of Namibian self-determination. If South Africa again refuses to live by the terms of Resolution 435, will the U.S. government acquiesce? Will the U.S. again refuse to support comprehensive economic sanctions against South Africa through the U.N. Security Council? Or will it seek to ensure that independence runs its full course by strongly supporting the U.N. supervision of elections? And will the U.S. give an independent Namibia the economic assistance it will need to overcome 100 years of colonialism, including strong U.S. support for any Namibian efforts to reclaim Walvis Bay and otherwise reduce the new nation's economic dependence?

The strong U.S. interest in a genuinely independent Namibia is closely linked to the U.S. national interest to see an end to South African apartheid and the achievement of self-determination by that nation's black majority. U.S. policy must therefore aim to defend Namibia and the region from paying an inflated political price to rid itself of South Africa's domination. ▪

The Tripartite Agreement—Major Points

South Africa's decision to remove its troops came after months of intense, U.S.-brokered negotiations last year, which led to the widely publicized signing of the Tripartite Agreement between Angola, Cuba, and South Africa on December 22, 1988. The primary measures of the agreement include the following:

- **A commitment to implement United Nations Security Council Resolution 435, the comprehensive Namibian peace plan adopted by the U.N. in 1978. The resolution outlines in detail how U.N.-sponsored elections are to be held; arranges for a cease-fire between South Africa and SWAPO; and establishes a time-frame for the withdrawal of all South African military forces and government officials.**

Under Resolution 435, the independence process is scheduled to begin April 1, 1989, with the arrival of the United Nations Transitional Assistance Group (UNTAG), an international civilian and military body assigned to peacekeeping and election monitoring. Shortly after elections, which are due to be held by November 1, 1989, a constitution is to be drafted and a government formed—leading to independence on or around April 1, 1990. The UNTAG group will be commanded by the U.N. Special Representative, who is appointed by and reports directly to U.N. Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar.

- **Provides for the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola and South African forces from Namibia. The 27-month phased withdrawal of Cuban troops is due to be completed by July 1, 1991. (However, as a good-faith gesture, 500 Cuban soldiers left Angola within a month of the agreement's signing.) By June 1, 1989, the estimated 50,000 to 75,000 South African troops based in Namibia must be reduced to 1,500 and confined to barracks, with similar arrangements for armed SWAPO members. Verification of the troop withdrawals will be monitored in Angola by separate U.N. observers and in Namibia by the UNTAG group.**

Who Defends America? Race, Sex, and Class in the Armed Forces

Forthcoming Joint Center Publication Examines the Policy Implications of Black Overrepresentation in America's All-Volunteer Military Forces

Black fighting men have played a pivotal role in every major American conflict, beginning with the Revolutionary War itself. However, it wasn't until the draft was abolished in 1973 and the all-voluntary military force was established that black representation increased significantly. Today, while blacks comprise 12 percent of the country's population, they make up 20 percent of all active-duty military personnel—and within the army, nearly 30 percent. These statistics concern some analysts and policy makers, while others view them as a normal outcome of the military's nondiscrimination policy.

Will current trends in enlistment and the racial makeup of the military have any effect on the nation's long-term security? And how do we weigh the benefits minorities may gain from the military in training, education, and employment against the burdens they may have to bear in a conventional war? These and related questions are addressed in the Joint Center's latest publication, *Who Defends America? Race, Sex, and Class in the Armed Forces,* edited by Edwin Dorn, deputy director of research at the Center. The 11 essays and reports that compose the volume, written by a diverse group of scholars and public officials, grew out of a symposium sponsored by the Joint Center and hosted by the Johnson Foundation. Following are selected highlights.

Black Overrepresentation. The current all-volunteer approach to the armed forces was established as the Vietnam War wound down in the early 1970s. At the time, critics questioned whether the changeover would cause a disproportionate rise in the number of minorities in the ranks. Defense Secretary Melvin Laird, testifying before Congress on behalf of the new system, dismissed the prediction as unwarranted. He turned out to be wrong.

Since 1973, the representation of blacks in active military positions has nearly doubled. Alvin Schexnider of Virginia Commonwealth University and Ed Dorn note, however, that black representation varies widely depending on rank, service branch, and occupational specialty. Blacks make up only three percent of officers in the navy but are 10 percent of the officers in the army and almost 30 percent of the army's active-duty enlisted personnel. Some observers have cautioned that this "imbalance" in the army, together with the disposition of troops, makes it likely that, should hostilities occur in Korea or Europe, blacks would make up a third of the initial casualties.

Imbalances in Economic Background. According to Northeastern University professor Charles Moskos, the competitive benefits offered today to attract recruits appeal especially to those who are finding private employment hard to obtain—the economically and educationally deprived of all races and backgrounds. Moskos writes further that whereas black service personnel are fairly representative of the social and economic spectrum of the black civilian population, white personnel come disproportionately from the white population's least educated and lowest-income segments.

Former national security advisor McGeorge Bundy expresses a similar concern, that young middle-class whites are rejecting military service, and asks whether the nation can afford to allow such a large group of its citizenry to view defense as someone else's job.

The Military as an Employer. Robert Fullinwider of the University of Maryland argues that those who believe the current recruitment system "forces" low-income blacks into the military are really operating on the premise that voluntary military service is more degrading than unemployment. This premise, he believes, denigrates both military service and the motives of blacks who enter it.

The question remains open, nevertheless, whether blacks have adequate opportunities for advancement within the military. Elsie Moore, professor at Arizona State University, notes that blacks who qualify for enlistment have lower average test scores than whites, and can therefore expect to find poorer training opportunities and slimmer career prospects than whites in the services.

Debating the All-Volunteer Approach. The issue of racial disproportion is used by some to challenge the merits of maintaining the all-volunteer system. Proponents of the system, including former DOD assistant secretary Laurence Kolb, argue that it is the most cost-effective way to run the military, attracting those people most likely to stay in the services and thereby avoiding the added training costs associated with a high-turnover draft system.

Returning to some form of draft or mandatory service is at least a distant possibility. Nevertheless, Congressman Les Aspin notes that although many rank-and-file voters and some members of Congress prefer to abandon the all-volunteer approach, a renewed draft could restore racial balance only by drafting whites only, a drastic measure Congress is unlikely to consider. ■

Copies can be purchased through the Order Department, Joint Center for Political Studies Press, 4720 Boston Way, Lanham, MD 20706; telephone 301-459-3366.

This review was prepared by Marc DeFrancis, senior editor at the Joint Center.

American Competitiveness
(Continued from page 4)

Toward Some Solutions

Clearly, much more can be done to give American companies better access to foreign markets. This includes not only removing unfair barriers to American goods and services, but helping small and medium-size companies overcome the normal administrative and cultural barriers of foreign markets. At the same time, American laws against unfair import practices should be aggressively enforced. U.S. trade officials should negotiate agreements with our trading partners on bilateral issues such as restrictions on American financial-service firms in Europe and obstacles to the sale of American computer products in Japan.

More importantly, however, the U.S. government must launch an effective strategy to address domestic factors that have a more profound effect on the trade deficit. To succeed, such a strategy must have at least five important features:

- Domestic consumption must be slowed to allow production to shift to the export market. This must be done carefully so that declining domestic demand can be adequately replaced by an increased demand for exports and, thus, not trigger a recession. Traditional methods for slowing consumption—raising interest rates and taxes—have the unfortunate effect of slowing down production as well.
- Imports must not be discouraged through trade restrictions. Import competition is a crucial and effective incentive for domestic producers to raise the quality of their products and services to globally competitive standards.
- The merger, acquisition, and leveraged buyout binges must be moderated. Considerable capital and management resources are consumed by these activities, which also cause a loss in jobs. There is little evidence that this corporate raiding is significantly improving production efficiency, product quality, or customer service.
- The tax laws should be amended to encourage capital investment rather than discourage it as they now do. Tax breaks should also be used to encourage more spending on research and development, with emphasis on research.
- The federal government should promote and facilitate greater export consciousness and participation among medium-size firms with demonstrated export potential. The government should provide these companies with information on sales opportunities and technical assistance in the areas of administrative procedures, shipping, and finance.

To Change Corporate Thinking

While political leadership is critically important, the most significant contribution must come from the private sector itself. Its challenge is not to develop and adhere to a list of mandated procedures for boosting exports. The challenge to American business is to change the way corporate managers think about product development, manufacturing, and service. Managers must adopt the global view whether or not they believe their company is involved in international trade.

Whether service provider or manufacturer, producer for export or for domestic sales, American industries have become inescapably bound to the standards of global competition. Government policies and a corporate ethos that fail to grasp these new realities will only assure the continued decline of American competitiveness. Only through a clear understanding of the problem and an earnest commitment by government, business, and the people themselves to address these problems, can the United States meet this challenge. ■

FOCUS
Joint Center for Political Studies®
1301 Pa. Ave., N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 626-3500

ADDRESS
CORRECTION
REQUESTED

Postmaster: Form 3547 requested

NOTICE TO READERS: Please notify FOCUS of any change of address or title. YOU MUST ATTACH THE MAILING LABEL FROM THE BACK COVER when writing about service or change of address. No change can be made without this information. Allow 6 weeks for change of address to take effect. Thank you.

NON-PROFIT
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT No. 6958
Washington, D.C.

5/10/89 R5685-4

Volume 17, No. 4
April 1989

FOCUS

The monthly magazine of the Joint Center for Political Studies®

A Voice for the Rural Poor

Black Congressman Calls for National Focus on Poverty in the Lower Mississippi Valley

Falling Behind Despite Employment Gains

While Blacks Gained Jobs in 1988,
They Made Little Advancement Compared to White Workers

The Charitable Appeals Fact Book

New Joint Center Publication Details the Giving Patterns of Black and White Americans
and the Fundraising Techniques to Which They Are Most Responsive

POLITICAL TRENDLETTER®

Perspective

ISSN 0740-0195
PRICE $1.50

Needed: Black Initiative and Government Activism

Two years ago, the Joint Center's Committee on Policy for Racial Justice published an essay on the need for new approaches to problems confronting the black community. The 29 distinguished experts on that committee argued that the government must meet its responsibility to help make available to all Americans jobs paying living wages. They agreed that the government must shore up the deteriorating infrastructures and services needed to keep the nation's towns and cities running. They also stated that the government must not be permitted to shirk its duty to improve public education, reform the welfare system, provide retraining for the unemployed, and construct affordable housing for those most in need.

In the same essay, these eminent scholars and policy analysts argued that the black community, drawing upon its long tradition of self help, must expand its efforts to tackle a new variety of unusually resistant social and economic problems.

The ideas expressed in that essay are relevant to today's problems, and the articles in this issue of *Focus* touch on several of them. Mississippi congressman Mike Espy describes the desperate living conditions of the rural poor in the lower Mississippi valley, many of them his own constituents. This seven-state region generally ranks at the bottom nationally in literacy, employment, and health care. Espy believes the federal government must adopt new approaches to deal with the plight of America's rural population, particularly in the areas of housing and economic development.

This issue also includes our annual employment update, in which economist Margaret Simms reviews employment and poverty data for 1988. Her report shows that while black employment rates rose last year, the standard of living for many black workers remains at or below the poverty line. Simms notes that the recently passed Family Security Act and the minimum wage bills now before Congress will have little effect on lifting low-wage workers and their families out of poverty. Here too, greater governmental efforts are required if poverty is to be successfully combatted.

Finally, a review of a forthcoming Joint Center publication, *The Charitable Appeals Fact Book,* contradicts the cynical portrayal of the black middle-class as self-interested and ungenerous. The *Fact Book* sheds new light on the black community's willingness to help itself and others. The Center's ground-breaking study of philanthropic behavior allows us to compare, for the first time, the charitable causes and the fundraising techniques to which black and white Americans are most likely to respond.

The articles in this issue of *Focus* reaffirm what the JCPS Committee on Policy for Racial Justice wrote two years ago: that even with increased black initiative, the desperation of poor and low-income Americans—rural and urban, employed and jobless—will not be relieved until the government finds new approaches and, yes, becomes more active in dealing with national social problems. ■

Eddie N. Williams

PRESIDENT

FOCUS Copyright © 1989 Joint Center for Political Studies, Inc.® The monthly magazine of the **Joint Center for Political Studies,** 1301 Pa. Ave., N.W., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20004 (202) 626-3500. The Joint Center for Political Studies is a national, nonprofit, tax-exempt institution that conducts research on public policy issues of special concern to black Americans and promotes informed and effective involvement of blacks in the governmental process. Founded in 1970, the Joint Center provides independent and nonpartisan analyses through research, publication, and outreach programs. Opinions expressed in signed *Focus* articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Joint Center for Political Studies. *Focus* is published monthly. $15.00 per year by JCPS, Inc.

PRESIDENT/Eddie N. Williams
VICE PRESIDENT/Eleanor Farrar
DIRECTOR OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT/Kathleen Vander Horst
DIRECTOR OF FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION/Brenda Watkins Noel
DIRECTOR OF INFORMATION RESOURCES/Auriel Pilgrim
DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH/Milton Morris
DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL POLICY INSTITUTE/Russell Owens

ASSOC. DIR. OF COMMUNICATIONS, PUBLICATIONS, MEDIA RELATIONS & PUBLIC AFFAIRS/Frank Dexter Brown
ASSOC. DIR. OF COMMUNICATIONS, ELECTRONIC PROGRAMS/Mark Lloyd
EDITOR, *Focus*/David C. Ruffin
SENIOR EDITOR/Marc DeFrancis
CONTRIBUTING EDITOR/Linda F. Williams
PUBLIC AFFAIRS SPECIALIST/Deborah D. Davis
ASSOCIATE EDITOR/Constance B. Toliver
TRENDLETTER RESEARCHER/Alfred Baltimore
WORD PROCESSOR/Merlinda Ceniza Novicio

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Wendell Freeland/Attorney at Law, *Chairman*
Andrew F. Brimmer/Brimmer and Company, Inc., *Vice Chairman*
Louis E. Martin/Calmar Communications, *Treasurer*
Bishop John Hurst Adams/Senior Bishop, A.M.E. Church
Robert McCormick Adams/Smithsonian Institution
Norma Asnes/Writer
Hannah D. Atkins/Secretary of State, Oklahoma
Lucius J. Barker/Washington University
George L. Brown/Grumman Corporation
Charles U. Daly/John F. Kennedy Library and Museum
Mervyn Dymally/U.S. House of Representatives
Marian Wright Edelman/Children's Defense Fund
Luther Hilton Foster/Alexandria, Virginia
Charles V. Hamilton/Columbia University
Jayne Brumley Ikard
Bernard Rapoport/American Income Life Insurance Co.
Eddie N. Williams/Joint Center for Political Studies

Members Emeriti: William B. Boyd, Robert C. Maynard, James D. Wolfensohn

Eleanor Farrar/JCPS, *Secretary to the Board*

A Voice for the Rural Poor

Black Congressman Calls for National Focus on Poverty in the Lower Mississippi Valley

by Rep. Mike Espy

Last year, Cormiller Andrews, a poor, black grandmother, spent her 87th birthday in a run-down shed on a rural back road of Flora, Mississippi, a small town in the central part of the state. The shed, which had been her home for 30 years, had no heat, no indoor plumbing, and no electricity. For five years before she came to live there, her only shelter had been two doorless refrigerators pulled together and covered with a piece of board. Somehow she survived.

Cormiller's life is not very different from that of the 40 to 50 people who reside in the rural community of Blue Hill, about 100 miles from Flora. While their homes provide better shelter than Cormiller's, most of the residents of Blue Hill have gone all their lives without clean drinking water. They catch rain water for drinking and many use a polluted creek nearby for washing clothes, bathing, and cooking.

The living conditions of the poor in Flora and Blue Hill are not uncommon in the state's mostly rural 2nd congressional district, which I represent. Indeed, these conditions are not uncommon for many poor people living in rural areas throughout the nation. While poverty is most often thought of as an urban problem, in fact it is growing at a faster rate in rural America than in the nation's inner cities (see "The Forgotten Poor: Blacks in Rural Areas," *Focus*, July 1988). Few places in the country are more depressed or less developed than the seven-state region of the lower Mississippi valley, which ranks at or near the bottom in practically every social and economic indicator. Three states in the region—Mississippi, Louisiana, and Arkansas—have among the five highest rates of poverty in America.

Concern for the poor in this region of the country prompted me to introduce the Lower Mississippi Delta Development Act, enacted by Congress last year as a part of the Rural Development and Agriculture Appropriations bill. The measure created a nine-member commission assigned to an 18-month study of conditions in the region, which includes Arkansas, southern Illinois, western Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, southeastern Missouri, and western Tennessee. The commission consists of one member from each state appointed by the respective governor, as well as one member appointed by the president and one appointed by the Small Business Administration. The commission will present its findings and recommendations to the Congress, the President, and the governors of the concerned states roughly one year from now.

This study commission may prove to be vital in bringing national attention to an area whose influence has faded in recent years. As more of our young people leave family farms and small family businesses for educational and career opportunities in urban centers, the voice of rural America grows ever fainter on Capitol Hill, where the loss of population has resulted in a loss of congressional seats. And although more than 70 million citizens still live in America's rural communities, only a handful of congressmen, including myself, represent predominantly rural districts.

The new commission can be a persuasive voice in Washington for those living in the blighted delta region. By developing policies that could improve the region's economic and social conditions, it could also help President George Bush keep his promise of a kinder, gentler nation. The need is urgent, because the states in the region not only rank at the bottom in per capita income but rank at the top in illiteracy, infant mortality, youth unemployment, and the percentage of families receiving public assistance.

I recently submitted a report to the commission recommending an approach to regional development. The following is a summary of that report, focusing on what is needed in the areas of economic and business development and housing.

Economic and Business Development

Growth in small business can stimulate the region's overall economic growth. Across the country, small businesses, those with 500 employees or fewer, are shouldering much of the burden of job creation and innovation, creating more than 60 percent of the new jobs and generating nearly 40 percent of the gross national product. Moreover, they provide employment for 56 percent of nonmetropolitan workers.

(Continued on page 4)

Rep. Espy (D-Miss.) is on the Budget, Agriculture, and Select Hunger committees of the U.S. House of Representatives.

A Voice for the Rural Poor

(Continued from page 3)

Recommendations

- The federal government should establish a set-aside program for small, rural business owners which would target a certain percentage of all federal procurement for goods and services to the areas designated under the commission. This type of set-aside program would be an efficient way to use existing federal programs to stimulate economic growth without contributing significantly to the federal deficit.

Additionally, and perhaps most importantly, this type of target program would ensure economic diversity and provide an essential partnership between the federal government and the region's rural businesses. If the lower Mississippi valley's rural areas are to survive, they must become economically diversified and less dependent on agriculture.

- A rural development bank should be created to guarantee business loans to small and rural business owners and become a secondary market for the loan portfolios of local banks. Federally created finance banks are needed to deal in secondary markets to assist local banks to finance projects, start up businesses, and support infrastructure development.
- The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) should be authorized to provide a credit support program to subsidize interest payments for either existing or new businesses with bank-loan interest rates of as low as eight percent. These loans must be made available to those rural business owners who could generate a high proportion of jobs for the local area.
- Rural enterprise zones should be created to attract new businesses and to provide tax breaks to industries that hire additional labor in rural communities.
- Existing rural-development loan funds should be expanded through the USDA, making loan capital and technical assistance available to small business owners through nonprofit agencies dedicated to rural development. Mississippi Action for Community Education, which is in my district, is one example of such a development agency.
- A complementary grant program to bolster a rural development loan fund administered through the USDA should be established. It could provide grants for business capital to rural business owners, as well as grants for public improvements such as water and sewer systems and road construction.

Housing

A housing crisis threatens the lower Mississippi valley. The housing stock in many smaller, poorer communities is not decent, sanitary, or safe—falling well below the minimum standards most Americans take for granted. Hundreds of thousands of lower-income rural families are living in physically inadequate and often overcrowded housing or are carrying an unaffordable burden in housing costs. Furthermore, construction of adequate housing is often hampered by the lack of a community infrastructure, which normally includes central water and sewer facilities. Federal agencies, such as the Farmers Home Administration (FmHA), have provided little in the way of housing financing.

Since home-ownership offers manifold benefits for development, the opportunity for home-ownership should be extended to more lower-income families in the region. In addition to improving basic housing standards, home-ownership provides an education in budget and household management, incentives to save, and an opportunity to gain equity. Furthermore, it nurtures pride of ownership.

But every year, housing costs are consuming more of the typical low-income rural family's budget, having increased by 64 percent from 1975 to 1983 (compared to 54 percent for poor urban families).

Recommendations

- A variation of the current Section 502 FmHA program should be adopted to defer the repayment of house loans for lower-income families unable to afford a Section 502 loan at one percent. Research has shown that the history of repayments in the current Section 502 program has been excellent, particularly among poverty-level households, and that the subsidies required declined steadily for most borrowers.
- A federal demonstration project should be established to determine the willingness of rural banks and other private-sector investors, such as insurance companies, to participate in the construction of low-income housing when federal subsidies, including grants and tax credits, are available. One approach would be to authorize $20 million for grants to nonprofit organizations which would use these funds to develop partnerships with the private sector for low-income rental housing. Under this approach, federal grants from FmHA could be made available to finance portions of rental housing developments.
- An outreach program should be launched to provide technical assistance and housing counseling in underserved areas where there are high concentrations of poverty and substandard housing. The purpose of this program would be to assist mayors and community leaders in small, isolated communities (of less than 2,500) not currently served by FmHA housing programs.
- A program should be established to target FmHA Section 502 and 515 resources, along with grant funds for housing construction in underserved communities.

The commission has already begun its work, and I hope the Congress and the President will make the commission's report the basis for rural development legislation. If the federal government can move forward in partnership with state and local governments and the region's business community, the poor of Flora and Blue Hill may have a chance to do better than just survive. ■

Editor's note: Through the efforts of Rep. Espy's office, Cormiller Andrews was recently relocated to a trailer home and has been allocated a Section 8 rent subsidy. A $150,000 grant/loan has been secured to extend water and sewer lines to the community of Blue Hill.

April 1989

JCPS

POLITICAL TRENDLETTER®

Inside This Issue

- **A JCPS National Policy Institute Steering Committee delegation of black Americans attends inaugural ceremonies for the Parliamentary Black Caucus in London and learns that racial problems in Britain are similar to those in the U.S.**
- **TL previews reapportionment coming after the 1990 census and looks at how it may affect legislative representation in selected states.**
- **TL lists more black federal officials appointed and nominated by President Bush.**

American Delegation Attends Inauguration of Parliamentary Black Caucus

Over 700 people attended the inaugural ceremonies for the Parliamentary Black Caucus in London including a national conference on issues and strategies. Actively involved in the convocation was a National Policy Institute (NPI) delegation from the U.S., headed by Rep. Ronald Dellums, which included the heads of the national organizations of black elected officials:

- New York State Supreme Court Justice **HOWARD BELL**, chair of the Judicial Council of the National Bar Association
- Prince George's County, Maryland, Council Member **HILDA PEMBERTON,** president of the National Association of Black County Officials
- Pennsylvania State Representative **DAVID P. RICHARDSON, JR.**, president of the National Black Caucus of State Legislators
- Muskegon Heights, Michigan, Councilwoman **RILLASTINE WILKINS,** president of the National Black Caucus of Local Elected Officials
- Atlantic City Mayor **JAMES USRY,** president of the National Conference of Black Mayors

President of the Joint Center for Political Studies EDDIE N. WILLIAMS, as well as RUSSELL OWENS, director of the Joint Center's National Policy Institute, also attended, as did Congressmen CHARLES RANGEL (D- N.Y.) and GEORGE CROCKETT (D-Mich.) and board members of the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation. The centerpiece of the conference, held during the last week of March, was a full day of seminars on education, religion, economic problems, international affairs, and political development. Much of the discussion concerned the parallels between the experiences of British and American blacks.

In many ways the Parliamentary Black Caucus, like the CBC, was born out of a recognition that the problems confronting blacks required a strong and unified black political voice to serve as the conscience of the nation. The Parliamentary Black Caucus consists of four members, including **LORD PITT OF HAMPSTEAD**, appointed to the House of Lords in 1975, and three members of parliament elected to the House of Commons in 1987: **DIANE ABBOT, KEITH VAZ,** and **BERNIE GRANT.**

Over the past 30 years, blacks and other nonwhites have migrated to Britain from former colonies seeking greater social and economic opportunity. According to recent estimates, there are four million nonwhite Britons living in the United Kingdom, seven percent of the country's 56 million people. And while these blacks, ethnic Indians, and Pakistanis have become a real presence in the British population, many of them remain on its social, political, and economic fringes.

Nonwhite communities in Britain are often plagued by the same social ills that confront America's inner cities and black communities, including disproportionately high unemployment and inferior state-run schools. Likewise, the number of single-parent households is growing, substance abuse and associated violence are on the rise, and the number of school dropouts is increasing. And, as in America, blacks in Britain are less likely to enter universities than whites.

One major difference between the two countries lies in the fact that, over time, American blacks have been able to create their own institutions as a way of dealing with the many barriers to economic, social, and political equality. These include historically black colleges and universities, political and civil rights groups, fraternal organizations, and businesses and research institutions. The long and arduous struggle for equality in America has also brought about constitutional and legal protections against discrimination and racism—including civil rights, equal opportunity, and affirmative action measures—which have no substantial counterpart in British law. Neither do black Britons have such strong independent advocacy and service institutions as are present in black American communities.

One outcome of the conference was a commitment by those in attendance to help resolve the problems of black Britain by holding similar meetings in the future, with the aim of developing new strategies for international cooperation. The members of the American delegation, for their part, promised to help forge links between the social, political, economic, and educational institutions of black America and those emerging among blacks in a rapidly changing Britain.

High Stakes in the Coming Battle Over Redistricting

Northeastern and Midwestern states are projected to lose 16 congressional seats through reapportionment after the completion of the 1990 Census. This forecast by Election Data Services, a Washington-based political consulting firm that specializes in redistricting, anticipates that the lost seats will be gained by Southern and Western states. According to the Southern Regional Council (SRC), an Atlanta based research organization focused on democracy and opportunity in the South, population changes will distribute political power away from urban and rural areas to suburbs, away from the Democrats to the Republicans, and away from some predominantly black districts to white-controlled districts. SRC also noted that the Congressional districts losing population have elected members of Congress whose voting records evidence a strong, consistent representation of urban America, the poor, civil rights, civil liberties, labor, women, the environment, and nuclear disarmament.

Reapportionment—Gains and Losses

States Projected to Gain Congressional Seats		States Projected to Lose Congressional Seats	
Arizona	1	Illinois	2
California	6	Iowa	1
Florida	3	Kansas	1
Georgia	1	Massachusetts	1
North Carolina	1	Michigan	2
Texas	3	Montana	1
Virginia	1	New York	3
		Ohio	2
		Pennsylvania	2
		West Virginia	1

Source: Election Data Services, April 1989

The black political base of several black members of Congress could be eroded by redistricting. Several districts currently represented by blacks have experienced population drains over the last decade, which could lead to their boundaries being radically redrawn or to the districts' being eliminated altogether. That is why many minority organizations are pressing for greater accuracy in the Census and are preparing strategies to counterbalance an expected undercount. They are especially worried about districts in New York, Illinois, and Michigan, which have two or more black congressmen and which are projected to lose two or three seats each in the coming reapportionment.

Nevertheless, the horizon is not entirely bleak. Georgia, North Carolina, Texas, Virginia, and other states with large black populations are expected to gain new seats, potentially offering blacks new opportunities for elected office at the state and federal levels. –

Although shifts in population, identified by the Census, are a precondition for any realignment of state districts, it is the state legislatures that choose the methods by which the maps are redrawn. These methods vary from state to state, and can depend on which party holds a legislative majority or on the decisions of the governor.

"It all depends on who's at the table when the districts are being carved up," says KIMBALL BRACE, president of Election Data Services. Redrawing district maps is always a contentious process, but it is made even more so when the two legislative houses in a given state are controlled by different parties—as is the case in Michigan, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. Each of those states is expected to lose at least two seats to reapportionment. Another political factor that can strain the process occurs when the governor belongs to a party opposing the one in control of either or both houses of the legislature. Since most of the states that must realign their districts will hold gubernatorial elections next year, the anticipated mix of players makes it likely that there will be a number of tense battles. In the midst of many of these battles will be black state legislators, many of whom are organized into legislative caucuses with redistricting agendas of their own.

Even the U.S Justice Department will become a player in some states. Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act mandates that redistricting plans be submitted to its Civil Rights Division for preclearance to ensure there is no discriminatory impact on the political rights of minorities. Among the 16 states covered by Section 5 are Texas and Virginia, while in other states Section 5 applies only to certain counties, as in California and North Carolina. (These four states are discussed in "Across the Nation.")

In the special "Across the Nation" segment that follows, TL looks at selected states with large black populations that are likely to pick up from one to six congressional seats as a result of redistricting. TL will feature states expected to lose congressional seats in a future issue of *Focus*.

More Bush Administration Appointments and Nominations

Appointed:

KENNETH E. BOLTON, Director, Minority Business Development Agency (MBDA) in the Department of Commerce. Bolton leaves the post of director of the Office of Policy at the U.S. Department of Transportation's Urban Mass Transportation Administration, which he headed since 1982. Previously, Bolton was the executive director of the Transportation Department's Minority Business Resource Center (from 1976 to 1980), and senior project manager of the New Community Development Corporation at the Department of Housing and Urban Development (1973 to 1976). He began his career as a systems analyst with Rockwell International.

CONDOLEEZZA RICE, Director for Soviet and East European Affairs, National Security Council. Dr. Rice is on leave of absence from Stanford University where she is an associate professor of political science at the Center for International Security and Arms Control. As the director of Soviet and East European affairs at the National Security Council in the White House, Rice will participate in the formulation of U.S. policy with respect to arms control and the Eastern bloc.

Nominated, Confirmation Pending:

JERRY MOORE, Ambassador to the Kingdom of Lesotho (in Southern Africa). Rev. Moore is pastor of the 19th Street Baptist Church in Washington, D.C., and chairs the board of the Washington Opportunity Industrialization Center. He was appointed to the Washington, D.C., city council by President Richard Nixon from 1970 to 1974 and won an elected seat on the council in 1974, serving until 1984.

STEPHANIE LEE-MILLER, Director of the Office of Commercial Space Transportation (OCST), Department of Transportation. As head of OCST, Lee- Miller will oversee the licensing of commercial space activities. She was a public affairs officer at the U.S. Department of Commerce from 1981 to 1983, and was appointed assistant secretary for public affairs at the Department of Health and Human Services from 1983 to 1987.

JERRY RALPH CURRY, Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Curry is a retired major general whose last post was deputy commanding general of the army's V Corps headquartered in Frankfurt, West Germany. He also commanded the Army Test and Evaluation Command at the Aberdeen Proving Ground in Maryland and commanded the U.S. Army Military District of Washington, D.C.

Across the Nation

The states below are projected to gain congressional seats as a result of reapportionment after the 1990 census.

CALIFORNIA: This state expects to send as many as six new representatives to Congress after redistricting in 1992. The Democrats hold solid majorities in both houses of the state legislature, and if they are victorious in next year's elections, they will have the right to redraw the state's legislative district lines. That may not be the end of it, however. The winner of the gubernatorial race could turn out to be a Republican, causing a stalemate between the legislature and a governor who can veto legislation. The stalemate could throw the whole matter into the courts, as happened in 1974. That year, governor **RONALD REAGAN** vetoed the state legislature's plan—and when neither party was willing to compromise, the district lines were redrawn by the courts.

Next year, Republican U.S. senator PETE WILSON will be running to replace retiring governor GEORGE DEUKMEJIAN, also a Republican, with the aim of counterbalancing the Democrats' control over the legislature. His opponent in that contest could be state attorney general JOHN VAN DE KAMP, former San Francisco mayor DIANE FEINSTEIN, or state controller GRAY DAVIS. If Wilson is elected, he will undoubtedly butt heads with WILLIE BROWN, the powerful black speaker of the assembly who was instrumental in putting together the last redistricting plan after the 1980 census. Republicans so opposed that plan they unsuccessfully sued to have it overturned.

Even before the 1990 campaign begins, the Republicans may hedge their bets by placing on the ballot a reapportionment initiative that would take the redistricting process away from the legislature and give it to the courts. However the process shakes out, political insiders do not expect any losses in the four seats currently held by blacks. They forecast that with the creation of more seats, Asians and Hispanics, the state's two fastest growing minority groups, would stand a better chance of getting elected. It is feared, nevertheless, that a census undercount in the Los Angeles area could jeopardize the prospects for minority gains.

NORTH CAROLINA: North Carolina will probably gain an additional congressional district. The North Carolina Legislative Black Caucus, led by Democratic state representative HENRY "Mickey" MICHAUX, JR., will attempt to have the general assembly realign the 2nd Congressional District, which encompasses Durham County, to include more black voters, thereby improving the chances for a black candidate to win in a newly configured district.

The Black Caucus, which is entirely Democratic, could face formidable obstacles in this effort. For one thing, Caucus members may have to contend with a House Democratic leadership that is beholden to the GOP. Although both houses are firmly in Democratic hands, this past January a coalition of 20 dissident Democrats teamed up with 47 Republicans to elect **JOSEPHUS MAVRETIC,** a conservative Democrat, as house speaker. As a *quid pro quo,* Mavretic promised Republican house members greater involvement in the redistricting process. This conservative legislative leadership, combined with the threat of a veto by GOP governor **JIM MARTIN,** may constrict the Black Caucus's chances of success.

Nevertheless, the Caucus has something in its favor. Several of its members hold senior rank in the house, including majority whip **MILTON FITCH,** who ranks fourth among Democratic leaders.

TEXAS:-The Lone Star State is expected to gain three more congressional seats. Local analysts expect one new district to be drawn in the Dallas-Fort Worth area with a majority or near-majority black constituency.

The big question is who the players will be when the new map is drawn. One man who will hold the answer to that question is **GIBSON "GIB" LEWIS,** speaker of the state House of Representatives, who has the power to appoint the majority of the members to the special House committee which will be formed to handle redistricting.

Lewis's counterpart in the state Senate is the lieutenant governor, who serves as the Senate president and has similar powers of appointment as the speaker. But incumbent Democratic lieutenant governor **BILL HOBBY,** in office since 1972, has decided not to run for reelection next year, leaving that post open.

Republican governor **BILL CLEMENTS** has also chosen not to seek another term. Whoever succeeds him will be another powerful force in the redistricting process. Two Democrats are already running hard for the governor's mansion—state treasurer **ANN RICHARDS,** the colorful keynote speaker at last year's Democratic National Convention, and state attorney general **JIM MATTOX.** Their primary race is already heating up. Richards has raised one million dollars for her campaign, while Mattox has collected four times that amount. Secretary of state **JACK RAINS** is expected to be a Republican contender.

The bottom line for state representative LARRY EVANS, chair of the Texas Legislative Black Caucus, speaking on behalf of his 14 colleagues in the House and Senate, is that "no plan will be tolerated that diminishes the present number of black legislators."

VIRGINIA: As in other states, three major segments of government will play a role in adding a new congressional seat in Virginia: the state Senate, the House of Delegates, and the governor. Since Democrats dominate both houses of the legislature the race for the governor's mansion will be crucial. "The governor's election will determine how the arithmetic of the redistricting process will be applied, since his veto would only need a third, plus one vote, from either house to be sustained," says black state senator BOBBY SCOTT from Newport News.

That's why Virginians are anxious to see if Democratic lieutenant governor **DOUGLAS WILDER** will succeed in his bid to become the nation's first black elected governor this November. **Local analysts contend there is no concentration of blacks anywhere in the state large enough to form a majority black district. If, however, a district is to be configured in which a black candidate would have a chance of winning, Wilder's active involvement will certainly be the key.**

Virginia is among the 16 states required under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act to submit its redistricting plan to the Justice Department for preclearance.

Falling Behind Despite Employment Gains

While Blacks Gained Jobs in 1988, They Made Little Advancement Compared to White Workers

by Dr. Margaret C. Simms

Recent reports from the Department of Labor bear good news, at least on the surface: in 1988 black unemployment reached its lowest level since 1974, with black workers gaining jobs at a faster rate than whites. Nevertheless, as in past years, there is a flip-side to these reports. Blacks lagged far behind whites in employment, remaining two-and-a-half times as likely to be unemployed.

Furthermore, the increase in jobs did not bring improvements in the standard of living for many black workers and their families. For even when black Americans worked full-time, a significant proportion were unable to earn enough to keep their families out of poverty. Thus, while some gains were made in 1988, the economic status of black workers and their families remained precarious. And neither newly passed federal legislation, such as the Family Security Act of 1988, nor legislative proposals to raise the minimum wage are likely to make a significant reduction in poverty among lower-income workers.

Falling Behind Despite Gains

During 1988, the nation's sixth year of uninterrupted economic expansion, approximately 2.5 million jobs were added to the U.S. economy. Almost 14 percent of these new jobs (349,000) were filled by black workers. (Hispanics filled an even higher percentage of these jobs—18 percent—although they make up a smaller share of the labor market). The combination of new and preexisting jobs held by blacks resulted in a higher proportion employed in 1988 than in any year since the Bureau of Labor Statistics began tabulating such data separately for blacks in 1972. In spite of this, employment for much of the black community still falls far behind white employment.

The unemployment rate for the nation as a whole fell from 6.2 percent in 1987 to 5.5 percent in 1988. The rate fell further for blacks than for whites—though from a much higher starting point—dropping from 12.7 to 11.7 percent while the white rate dropped from 5.4 to 4.7 percent. (See table 1.)

The unemployment rate is but one measure of labor market position. Since unemployment rates are affected by withdrawal from the labor market, a more useful measure is the percentage of the population that holds jobs. Using this measure, differences are more easily observed. While employment among black women in the prime working years (between the ages of 25 and 54) is similar to that for white women (67.0 percent compared to 69.9 percent), black adult men, by contrast, are significantly less likely to be holding jobs than their white counterparts. Nearly 91 percent of white men in this age group are employed, while the corresponding black rate is 80 percent. Racial disparities in employment among both male and female workers were even more severe for teenagers (between the ages of 16 and 19) and young adults (ages 20 to 24). Black teenagers, in fact, made few labor market gains during 1988 (see "Black Youth Face an Uncertain Jobs Future," *Focus*, April 1988).

Job Quality and Wages

Being employed is not the only factor affecting the well-being of the worker and his or her family. Earnings, benefits, and opportunities for career advancement are also important. Here again, blacks are not as well situated as whites. In 1988, nearly 50 percent of employed blacks were grouped in the occupations of service worker, operator (such as machine operator and truck driver), fabricator (such as welder or assembler), or laborer. These

(Continued on page 6)

Table 1. Unemployment Rates of the U.S. Population by Race, Gender, and Age, 1988

	White			Black		
	Men	Women	All	Men	Women	All
Total Population (age 16 and over)	4.7%	4.7%	4.7%	11.7%	11.7%	11.7%
Ages 16 to 19	13.9	12.3	13.1	32.7	32.0	32.4
Ages 20 to 24	7.4	6.7	7.1	19.4	19.8	19.6
Ages 25 to 54	3.8	3.9	3.9	8.9	9.4	9.2

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Employment and Earnings," January 1989.

Dr. Simms is an economist and is a deputy director of research at the Joint Center for Political Studies.

Black Employment

(Continued from page 5)

occupations tend to pay lower wages and offer less job stability than most others. The next largest segment of black workers is found in the administrative support occupations (such as clerk typist), where wages are also modest. Less than 20 percent of black workers were employed in managerial, professional, and technical occupations, where not only are salaries higher but opportunities for additional training and upward mobility are greater.

Few black workers earned enough in 1988 to raise their families above the poverty line. This was especially true for families with only one adult wage earner. For female-headed families that earned income, the median weekly earnings (including wages from all members) were only $291 a week. Even among those that enjoyed full-year employment, half brought in incomes that fell within 125 percent of the poverty line. Black married couples hardly fared better when they had only one wage earner in the household. Median family earnings for this group were only $281 a week, 65 percent of the corresponding earnings for similar white families. On average, black families moved into the middle-income category only when they had two or more people bringing home an earned income.

(Continued on page 8)

Low-Wage Earners and Poverty

It is sometimes argued that working at a low-wage job does not necessarily mean a low living standard, since many low-wage workers are in families where others also work. Though this is true in principle, it is far more likely to be the case in white families headed by men than in families of other types. Among black families, both income and the likelihood of employment are lower. And among all families with employment income, black families have lower earnings than white families. Data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics show that in 1988, one-earner families were more likely than others to be dependent on poverty or near-poverty weekly earnings.

Many black workers earn poverty-level wages even in the high-wage industries, according to a study by the Institute for Women's Policy Research (IWPR), a Washington-D.C. based organization devoted to research on issues of special concern to women. In an ongoing study with the Displaced Homemakers Network conducted for the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) and using data from the Census Bureau's 1984 "Survey of Income and Program Participation" (the most recently available), the Institute identified how close workers' earnings came to the poverty level ($10,600 in 1984) for a family of four even when they worked full-time, year-round. The researchers divided employment into four wage categories: *poverty wage* ($5.30/hour, which equaled the poverty income in 1984 if the worker was employed full-time, full-year); *above-poverty low-wage* ($5.31-7.95/hour, which would put the worker between 100 and 150 percent of poverty); *low-moderate wage* ($7.96-10.59/hour, which was 150-200 percent of poverty); and *moderate-and-above wage* ($10.60/hour and above).

The extent to which black workers, both men and women, are crowded into low-wage jobs is striking. Sixty-five percent of black men were employed in the two lowest wage categories in 1984, while over 80 percent of working black women held jobs in these categories, placing them all at or just above poverty wages. Even in manufacturing, which is commonly thought of as a high-wage industry, similar percentages hold true. And in some industries—those with generally low wage structures—the vast majority of black workers held jobs earning poverty or near-poverty wages.

These wage levels suggest an especially serious threat to the welfare of children. For all workers, regardless of race, those earning poverty-level wages are the most likely to live in households with children. The study shows that black children were especially likely to be in such families. The majority of black heads of household earned wages at or just above the poverty level in 1984. Seventy-six percent of black married men with nonworking wives earned $7.95 or less an hour, while 86 percent of single black men with children had similar earnings. Among black women the proportions were even higher: more than 66 percent of those with children and no other earner in the household had wages of $5.30 or less, while another 20 percent earned near-poverty wages.

Table 2. Employment by Wage Level for Black Workers in Households With Children Present, 1984 (numbers in thousands)

	Number in Labor Force	Below Poverty Low Wage		Above Poverty Low Wage		Low Moderate Wage		Moderate & Above Wage	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
BLACK MALES									
Married With Children									
Dual Earners	1,179	303	(25.7)	348	(29.5)	221	(18.7)	307	(26.0)
One Earner	822	409	(49.8)	217	(26.4)	107	(13.0)	89	(10.8)
Single With Children	498	315	(63.3)	111	(22.3)	28	(5.6)	45	(9.0)
Total With Children	2,499	1,026	(41.1)	676	(27.1)	356	(14.2)	441	(17.6)
BLACK FEMALES									
Married With Children									
Dual Earners	1,144	528	(46.2)	362	(31.6)	138	(12.1)	116	(10.1)
One Earner	489	375	(76.7)	87	(17.8)	19	(3.9)	8	(1.6)
Single With Children	1,653	1,064	(64.4)	395	(23.9)	111	(6.7)	83	(5.0)
Total With Children	3,286	1,967	(59.9)	844	(25.7)	268	(8.2)	206	(6.3)

Source: Institute for Women's Policy Research, based on tabulations from the Census Bureau's 1984 Survey of Income and Program Participation.

The Charitable Appeals Fact Book

New Joint Center Publication Details the Giving Patterns of Black and White Americans and the Fundraising Techniques to Which They Are Most Responsive

Black Americans are far more likely than whites to decide where to donate their money based on the advice and direction of their clergy, according to a study of philanthropic behavior recently completed at the Joint Center. "Our findings confirm what many suspected but could not demonstrate, namely that the church pulpit remains the prime resource broker in the black community," says Dr. Emmett Carson, the author of the study and a research associate at the Center. "What is remarkable is that even when you look beyond religious giving, blacks continue to place tremendous weight on the authority of their ministers and church officials."

These study results are amply illustrated in a forthcoming Joint Center publication, *The Charitable Appeals Fact Book*, which for the first time makes possible reliable, direct comparisons between the giving behavior and attitudes of whites and blacks. Based on extensive, face-to-face surveys conducted by the Gallup organization, the findings offered in the *Fact Book* allow fundraisers and scholars to examine how blacks prefer to be approached in fundraising appeals, which types of charitable causes they are most likely to support, and related facts, all broken down according to social, economic, and demographic indicators.

The data show, for example, that high-school educated blacks who donate to political causes are three times as likely to do so in response to appeals from their clergy (32 percent of blacks citing this preference) as they are in response to the advice of acquaintances (10 percent). Political donations are apparently viewed differently by whites of similar background, who are as likely to heed appeals from acquaintances (21 percent) as those from the clergy (19 percent).

The *Fact Book* also reveals differences between the types of causes blacks and whites prefer to support. A notable example is health organizations, which white givers are nearly twice as likely to support directly (42 percent) as blacks (26 percent). "These figures tell us a lot about the priorities people place on issues," Carson notes. Although the survey questions were very broad and therefore do not show how people respond to individual organizations, they do show which areas blacks tend to give money to. It is also worth noting that black churches, especially in cities, tend to reallocate church donations to a variety of community activities. "This may mean," says Carson, "that black charitable dollars wind up serving as diverse an array of purposes, including health causes, as white donations serve, even though the initial recipient among blacks is much more likely to be a church."

Although the study shows strong differences in the method of appeal most often responded to and in the causes preferred, it shows a surprising consistency in the percentage of people who give at all, regardless of race. It also shows that most appeal strategies are equally unsuccessful among both blacks and whites. Magazine and newspaper ads, for example, were cited by one percent of both groups as a method they would respond to, a minute response when set alongside appeals from clergy and acquaintances.

The following sampling of findings from the *Fact Book* is representative of the volume's breadth and precision:

- Religion dominates in the charitable sphere: with equal frequency blacks (60 percent) and whites (58 percent) give to their own churches or other religious organizations.
- Whites are far more likely than blacks to donate to political organizations (20 percent vs. 9 percent).
- For both racial groups, the preferred types of appeal fell out in roughly the same order.

Responsiveness to Different Kinds of Charitable Appeals, for All Types of Organizations, by Race, 1985

Type of Appeal	Percentage Responding: Blacks	Percentage Responding: Whites
Clergy	36.9	21.9
Someone you know	14.2	23.4
Asked at work	11.2	10.1
Asked at home	9.4	11.2
Radio/telethon	4.2	4.3
Telephone call	3.7	3.5
TV commercial	3.7	2.1
Letter	3.2	9.0
Magazine/news ad	1.0	1.2

- Among the two most highly preferred appeals, however, blacks placed those by clergy (37 percent) far above those made by "someone you know" (14 percent), whereas whites rated both methods about equally (23 percent and 22 percent, respectively).
- Direct-mail letters were rated likely to draw a response far less often by blacks (3 percent) than by whites (9 percent).
- Southern blacks are nearly twice as likely (46 percent) as those in the West (25 percent) to respond to church appeals when they are made by the clergy. ■

Copies can be purchased through the Order Department, Joint Center for Political Studies Press, 4720 Boston Way, Lanham, Md. 20706; telephone 301-459-3366.

This review was prepared by Marc DeFrancis, senior editor at the Joint Center.

Black Employment

(Continued from page 6)

Policy Implications

Recently adopted and proposed legislative initiatives aimed at lifting poor families out of poverty will only be of limited value. Bills H.R.2 and S.4, passed separately by both houses of Congress to increase the minimum wage, would still leave families supported by one minimum-wage worker in poverty. Their proposal of $4.55 an hour would result in wages that would still fall 20 percent below the 1988 poverty level for a family of four. (See box entitled "How the Poverty Level Is Determined.") Naturally, any rise in the minimum wage would be beneficial, allowing poor families to narrow the gap between their income and the poverty level. But the proposed increase would not move families out of poverty altogether.

Furthermore, black families on welfare, particularly those headed by women, will be unlikely to work their way out of poverty through the provisions of the Family Security Act passed by Congress last year. This act is designed to remove long-term welfare dependents from the welfare rolls through employment and training programs (see "Welfare: Dependency vs. Reform," *Focus,* July 1988). However, if the jobs that women completing these programs are able to obtain prove to be anything like the jobs that black working women currently occupy, their families will remain mired in poverty for years to come. ■

How the Poverty Level Is Determined

Families and related individuals are classified as being above or below the poverty level using the poverty index, which originated at the Social Security Administration in 1964 and was revised by the Federal Interagency Committee in 1969 and 1980. The poverty index is based solely on money income (earned or otherwise) and therefore does not reflect the receipt of noncash benefits like food stamps. It reflects the different food purchasing requirements of families, based on their size and composition, derived from federal studies of food consumption in 1955 and 1961. Those early studies showed that American families spent about a third of their income on food. (The poverty level for families was therefore set at three times the minimal cost of an adequate food budget.) The index is adjusted annually for changes in the cost of living.

Some analysts have suggested, however, that this method of calculating the threshold is no longer appropriate because of the heavy reliance on an emergency food budget that was not meant to be used indefinitely. The poverty thresholds for recent years are shown below. [Note: An individual working full-time at the current minimum wage would earn approximately $7,000 a year.]

	Family of Three Persons	Family of Four Persons
1986	$8,737	$11,203
1987	9,056	11,611
1988	9,431	12,091

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

FOCUS
Joint Center for Political Studies®
1301 Pa. Ave., N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 626-3500

NOTICE TO READERS: Please notify FOCUS of any change of address or title. YOU MUST ATTACH THE MAILING LABEL FROM THE BACK COVER when writing about service or change of address. No change can be made without this information. Allow 6 weeks for change of address to take effect. Thank you.

NON-PROFIT
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT No. 6958
Washington, D.C.

ADDRESS
CORRECTION
REQUESTED

Postmaster: Form 3547 requested

26063
SRI
Acquisitions Editor
Congressional Info Svc, Inc.
4520 East-West Hwy.
Bethesda, MD 20814

Volume 17, No. 5 May 1989

R5685-4
6/7/89

Special Issue on Minority Business

FOCUS

The monthly magazine of the Joint Center for Political Studies®

Minority Business Performance: A Comparison Among Ethnic Groups

While Black Entrepreneurs Lag Behind Hispanics and Asians in Some Areas, They Lead in the Emerging Fields of Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate

Black Political Empowerment and Economic Advancement

New Study Reveals That Black Businesses Are More Successful in Cities Run by Black Mayors

Minorities and Privatization: Economic Mobility at Risk

New Joint Center Publication Reveals That Black Municipal Workers Feel the Employment Squeeze as City Governments Privatize Their Services

POLITICAL TRENDLETTER®

Perspective

ISSN 0740-0195

PRICE $1.50

JCPS Expands Research on Economic Policy

Since its founding in 1970, the Joint Center for Political Studies has been especially attentive to issues relating to political participation. And over the last two decades, we have researched, interpreted, and in some cases participated in the impressive political advances made by black Americans.

On the economic front, however, gains by blacks have not been nearly as impressive. In fact, by some measures, the economic condition of the black community is deteriorating. Inadequate education, joblessness, drug abuse, crime, family disintegration, homelessness, and deep-seated urban poverty are all rooted in the society's continuing failure to assure economic opportunities for all its citizens.

The widening gap in economic well-being between blacks and whites is among the more glaring evidence of society's unfulfilled commitment to equal opportunity. To narrow that gap and at the same time help rekindle American competitiveness in the international marketplace, we must have a better educated and skilled black work force, growth in black entrepreneurship, and a more prosperous and stable black consumer population.

Aware of the dangers that the devastating economic conditions mentioned above pose to blacks and the society as a whole, the Joint Center plans to significantly expand its research on economic policies and issues. We will conduct more research on the economic well-being of black Americans, paying special attention to issues such as equal opportunity in education and employment and the impact of technological changes on the world of work. Furthermore, we will pay more attention to the fiscal and monetary policies of the government as well as to trade, productivity, and competitiveness in the international marketplace. Our goal is to help black Americans achieve greater economic advances by increasing the level of black participation in formulating and implementing economic policies.

Our constituents and friends will hear more about these plans in the near future. Meanwhile, numerous efforts are already underway to bring national attention to the economic status of the black population. The articles in this special minority business issue of *Focus* reflect our concern. Economist Timothy Bates, a visiting scholar at JCPS, presents new data which show that black businesses are more successful in cities governed by black mayors. Economist Joyce Allen, our senior research associate, illustrates how much further black businesses need to go even to reach the level of viability achieved by other minority groups. And a review of the Joint Center's forthcoming book, *Minorities and Privatization,* reveals how blacks are affected when private firms are contracted to provide municipal services.

The twin objectives of political and economic empowerment will be driving forces in the lives of black Americans for years to come, as indeed they are in the life of the nation as a whole. President Franklin Roosevelt summed up our national aspiration in 1941 in these words:

> "...There is nothing mysterious about the foundations of a healthy and strong democracy. The basic things expected by our people of their political and economic systems are simple. They are: equality of opportunity for youth and for others; jobs for those who can work; security for those who need it; the ending of special privilege for the few; the preservation of civil liberties for all...in a wider and constantly rising standard of living."

This challenge is every bit as relevant and urgent today as it was 48 years ago. ■

Eddie N. Williams

PRESIDENT

FOCUS Copyright © 1989 Joint Center for Political Studies, Inc.® The monthly magazine of the **Joint Center for Political Studies,** 1301 Pa. Ave., N.W., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20004 (202) 626-3500. The Joint Center for Political Studies is a national, nonprofit, tax-exempt institution that conducts research on public policy issues of special concern to black Americans and promotes informed and effective involvement of blacks in the governmental process. Founded in 1970, the Joint Center provides independent and nonpartisan analyses through research, publication, and outreach programs. Opinions expressed in signed *Focus* articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Joint Center for Political Studies. *Focus* is published monthly. $15.00 per year by JCPS, Inc.

PRESIDENT/Eddie N. Williams
VICE PRESIDENT/Eleanor Farrar
DIRECTOR OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT/Kathleen Vander Horst
DIRECTOR OF FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION/Brenda Watkins Noel
DIRECTOR OF INFORMATION RESOURCES/Auriel Pilgrim
DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH/Milton Morris
DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL POLICY INSTITUTE/Russell Owens

ASSOC. DIR. OF COMMUNICATIONS, PUBLICATIONS, MEDIA RELATIONS & PUBLIC AFFAIRS/Frank Dexter Brown
ASSOC. DIR. OF COMMUNICATIONS, ELECTRONIC PROGRAMS/Mark Lloyd
EDITOR, *Focus*/David C. Ruffin
SENIOR EDITOR/Marc DeFrancis
CONTRIBUTING EDITOR/Linda F. Williams
PUBLIC AFFAIRS SPECIALIST/Deborah D. Davis
ASSOCIATE EDITOR/Constance B. Toliver
TRENDLETTER RESEARCHER/Alfred Baltimore
WORD PROCESSOR/Merlinda Ceniza Novicio

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Wendell Freeland/Attorney at Law, *Chairman*
Andrew F. Brimmer/Brimmer and Company, Inc., *Vice Chairman*
Louis E. Martin/Calmar Communications, *Treasurer*
Bishop John Hurst Adams/Senior Bishop, A.M.E. Church
Robert McCormick Adams/Smithsonian Institution
Norma Asnes/Writer
Hannah D. Atkins/Secretary of State, Oklahoma
Lucius J. Barker/Washington University
George L. Brown/Grumman Corporation
Charles U. Daly/John F. Kennedy Library and Museum
Mervyn Dymally/U.S. House of Representatives
Marian Wright Edelman/Children's Defense Fund
Luther Hilton Foster/Alexandria, Virginia
Charles V. Hamilton/Columbia University
Ira C. Herbert/Coca-Cola USA
Jayne Brumley Ikard
Bernard Rapoport/American Income Life Insurance Co.
Eddie N. Williams/Joint Center for Political Studies

Members Emeriti: William B. Boyd, Robert C. Maynard, James D. Wolfensohn

Eleanor Farrar/JCPS, *Secretary to the Board*

Minority Business Performance: A Comparison Among Ethnic Groups

While Black Entrepreneurs Lag Behind Hispanics and Asians in Some Areas, They Lead in the Emerging Fields of Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate

by Dr. Joyce Allen

This article is based on a forthcoming Joint Center study by Dr. Allen.

As Asians and Hispanics make economic inroads into some black communities, for example through buying mom-and-pop food stores and cleaning establishments, observers are asking why it is that black entrepreneurs seem to be outstripped by other minorities in the business field. Nationwide, blacks are less likely than members of other minority groups to own and operate a business. And since business participation is essential for economic growth in minority communities, the low rate of entrepreneurial development by blacks is a matter of real concern.

The data on minority businesses show that the relative position of black firms does vary, however, when measured against such indicators as total sales, levels of employment, type of business, and structural makeup. There are some areas where black firms actually outperform other minority-owned firms. But the overall picture shows that Hispanic and Asian entrepreneurs are more successful than blacks, a success partly attributable to the fact that other minority groups have greater access to financial resources and to such "social capital" as advanced education and entrepreneurial role models.

Black Firms Lag in Sales and Receipts

Even though black businesses are relatively few nationwide, they outnumber firms among other non-white minorities, according to the U.S. Census Bureau's Survey of Minority-Owned Business Enterprises for 1982. (This survey, conducted every five years, contains information on businesses owned by blacks, Hispanics, Asians, Pacific Islanders, and other minority groups. Data from the 1982 survey are the latest available.) In fact, blacks owned 339,239 or approximately 40 percent of all minority-owned businesses in 1982; Hispanics owned 248,141 (29 percent); and Asians owned 173,397 (21 percent).

Nevertheless, comparative data on business revenues reveal that Hispanic firms surpassed black firms in total sales and receipts, as did Asian firms. In 1982, black-owned firms generated $12.4 billion in receipts, versus $15 billion for Hispanic-owned firms and $14.5 billion for Asian-owned firms. This means that the black business community as a whole accounted for 27 cents of every dollar in minority-owned business receipts that year, compared with 33 cents for the Hispanic group, 32 cents for the Asian group, and 8 cents for the remaining groups.

Since black firms were more numerous than firms owned by the other two groups, these lower figures for overall receipts mean that the averages per individual firm were startlingly low among black entrepreneurs. With average annual sales and receipts of $36,681, black firms showed the poorest performance among all minority-owned firms. Asian-owned firms performed the best, with average sales and receipts of $83,417, while Hispanic firms averaged $60,354. These levels are all low, however, when compared to the average of $473,500 for all U.S. businesses.

Although Asian-owned businesses, as a group, have much higher average sales and receipts than black-owned businesses, some Asian subgroups fall far below the Asian average. Vietnamese businesses, for example, take in only slightly greater receipts than black businesses do. And businesses owned by two Pacific Islander ethnic groups, Filipinos and Hawaiians, have average receipts somewhat lower than those owned by blacks. A similar pattern is evident among Hispanic-owned businesses: those owned by Latin Americans (of Central or South American descent) generated average receipts only slightly higher than those owned by blacks.

Performance by Type of Business and Industry Mix

The preceding figures, while useful in making very broad comparisons, can be somewhat misleading since they fail to distinguish between diverse types of firms. In-

(Continued on page 4)

Dr. Allen is an economist and a senior research associate at the Joint Center.

Minority Business Performance

(Continued from page 3)

deed, for black owners, they obscure important differences between large and small businesses.

To obtain a clearer picture, it is useful to compare by form of organization—individual proprietorships, partnerships, and corporations. Individual proprietorships, which tend to be smaller businesses than partnerships or corporations, are the most numerous form of business in the United States. Corporations, however, are generally considered to have a greater long-term potential for expanded employment and growth in revenues than the other two types of firms.

This comparison reveals that the gap in receipts between those firms owned by blacks and those owned by other minority groups was narrower among corporations than among individual proprietorships and partnerships. Specifically, average sales and receipts of black corporations were 78.7 percent and 84.4 percent, respectively, of the sales and receipts of Hispanic and Asian corporations, and actually exceeded the performance of Puerto Rican, Latin American, and Cuban owned corporations. By contrast, among individual proprietorships, black receipts were only 56.5 percent of Hispanic receipts and 40.2 percent of Asian receipts. (Sales data are not available in the Survey of Minority-Owned Business Enterprises on Pacific Islanders or specific Asian subgroups such as Koreans, Vietnamese, and Chinese.)

Another way to refine the comparisons is to evaluate the type of industries where minority businesses prevail. Minority firms are disproportionately concentrated in industries with limited potential for growth. Selected services, such as beauty shops, barber shops, and photographic studios, and retail trade enterprises, like food and apparel stores and service stations, are two categories generally considered slow growth areas. While the majority (57 percent) of all businesses in the United States fall into these two categories, minority-owned firms are even more highly concentrated in them. Taken together, selected services and retail trade accounted for 68 percent of black businesses, 63 percent of Hispanic businesses, and 73 percent of Asian businesses in 1982.

While the survey shows blacks trailing Hispanics and Asians in most fields, it also shows blacks forging ahead in others. In the emerging industry of finance, insurance, and real estate, black entrepreneurs showed higher average sales and receipts than other minority owners. Average receipts in this industry were $50,451 for black owners, $47,652 for Pacific Islanders, $45,558 for Asians, and $37,457 for Hispanics.

A Source of Employment

Although the minority business sector is relatively small, it is an important source of employment for minority workers, often providing career opportunities unavailable elsewhere. Data from the Census Bureau's Characteristics of Business Owners survey indicate that the work force of minority-owned businesses, particularly black-owned businesses, is made up primarily of minority employees. About 60 percent of black employers report that their work force is 75 percent to 100 percent minority. These firms tend to employ minority workers for a variety of reasons, including the fact that minority enterprises are often located in central cities and serve ethnic communities.

Nevertheless, black-owned firms employed fewer workers overall than firms owned by individuals from other minority groups. In 1982, black businesses had an aggregate work force of 165,765 employees. By comparison, Hispanic-owned firms employed 189,636 persons while Asian-owned firms employed 186,355. The annual payroll of black-owned firms totalled $1.5 billion, while payroll figures for Hispanic and Asian owned firms totalled $1.7 billion each in 1982.

Black-owned firms with paid employees averaged 4.3 employees while Hispanic-owned firms and Asian-owned firms averaged 4.8 employees. There are exceptions for certain ethnic subgroups, however. Black firms employed at least one more person on average than did firms owned by Puerto Ricans, Latin Americans, Asian Indians, Koreans, Vietnamese, and Filipinos.

Factors Contributing to Poor Black Performance

There are several explanations for differences in performance among the various minority groups. One reason for the low ranking of black-owned businesses is that many of them are part-time or casual operations, owned and managed by individuals who are employed elsewhere full-time.

Furthermore, some researchers at the federal Minority Business Development Agency (MBDA) have pointed to the lower level of social capital available to black entrepreneurs than to Hispanic or Asian business owners as a contributing factor in their poorer performance. For example, blacks are less likely to have entrepreneurial parents or other close relatives who could pass along their business experience or serve as role models. And although blacks' educational level compares well with that of their Hispanic counterparts, it compares poorly with the educational level of Asian entrepreneurs.

The financial capital available to black entrepreneurs is also relatively low. They are not as likely as Asian or Hispanic owners to obtain investment capital from relatives and friends. Moreover, studies of financial capital and minority business by researchers such as Timothy Bates, economics professor at the University of Vermont, have shown a continuing pattern of redlining against blacks by commercial lending and investment institutions.

To move ahead in business development, black entrepreneurs need to continue entering emerging fields and develop larger-scale businesses. Discriminatory barriers to financial capital and higher education must be removed. Moreover, the black community must devise ways to expand the educational opportunities for current and future entrepreneurs, giving them the same advantages other minority entrepreneurs commonly enjoy. ■

May 1989

JCPS

POLITICAL TRENDLETTER®

Inside This Issue

- **Maryland Congressman Kweisi Mfume tries again to give the Minority Business Development Agency congressional authority and moves to amend the savings and loan bail-out bill.**
- **Civil rights and minority business leaders form a task force to respond to the Supreme Court's *Croson* decision striking minority business set-asides.**
- **The South African regime is failing in its attempt to sell a new image of its repressive system to the international community.**
- **President Bush is looking for a way to appoint Arthur Fletcher to head the Civil Rights Commission as Congress considers reauthorizing the agency.**

Kweisi Mfume's Business Agenda for the 101st Congress

In April, Democratic representative KWEISI MFUME from Baltimore reintroduced the Minority Business Development Act, H.R.1769, which would raise the status of the Minority Business Development Agency (MBDA) within the Commerce Department and for the first time give Congress a measure of control over MBDA's operations. Currently, the MBDA provides management, marketing, and technical assistance to about 9,000 minority entrepreneurs a year through 100 centers located around the country. Established in 1969 as the Office of Minority Business Enterprise by an executive order signed by President **RICHARD M. NIXON,** the MBDA would be restructured by Mfume's bill into a new entity headed by an assistant secretary holding subcabinet rank (the MBDA is presently headed by a "director").

The push to give the agency congressional authority was started by former congressman **PARREN J. MITCHELL,** Mfume's predecessor, who served as Baltimore's representative from 1971 to 1987. Mitchell, who chaired the House Small Business Committee from 1981 to 1987, sponsored legislation similar to H.R.1769 in 1980 and again in 1983. However, neither measure was adopted by Congress. It was Mitchell's objective, and now Mfume's, to make the MBDA less vulnerable to White House efforts to weaken or even abolish the agency. **In 1987, for example, President RONALD REAGAN proposed to merge the MBDA into the minority business set-aside program administered by the Small Business Administration. Reagan could have executed the merger with the stroke of a pen; since the MBDA had been established by executive order and its very existence is subject to the pleasure of the president. But the proposed merger, which Reagan tried to justify as a budget savings measure, was not actually attempted, largely because of strong protests from the minority business community and from a bipartisan group of senators and congressmen.**

The House passed H.R.1769 by voice vote during the last Congress on October 12, 1988. But the Senate companion bill, S.1848, sponsored by senators JOHN KERRY (D-Mass.) and PETE WILSON (R-Calif.), did not reach the Senate floor. Wilson plans to introduce a similar bill during this Congress.

Contrary to Reagan administration policy, the Bush administration, through Commerce secretary ROBERT A. MOSBACHER, supports the concept of upgrading the MBDA within the Commerce Department.

In other legislative action on minority business, Rep. ESTEBAN TORRES (D-Calif.) joined Rep. Mfume in offering a package of four amendments to the savings and loan bail-out bill. The amendments are designed to strengthen and protect minority-controlled financial institutions. Each of the amendments was incorporated into the House Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee version of the Financial Institution Reform, Recovery and Enforcement Act of 1989 (H.R.1278), a measure to respond to the continuing savings and

Joint Center for Political Studies® • 1301 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. • Washington, D.C. 20004 • 202/626-3500

loan crisis. The House is still considering H.R.1278 but the Senate passed its bail-out bill (S.774) on April 19. Summaries of the four amendments, adopted by the House Banking committee in April, follow:

- **Preservation of Minority Financial Institutions.** This amendment would help keep minority controlled savings and loan institutions solvent by improving training, technical assistance, and education programs available to them through the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC). Moreover, the FDIC would be required to give minorities priority in bidding for the ownership of insolvent minority institutions and of minority institutions involved in mergers and acquisitions.
- **Improved Minority Bank Deposit Program.** This amendment would expand the provisions of Executive Order 11626, which requires that the Treasury secretary work with other agencies to identify ways of using minority financial institutions as depositories of federal funds. This amendment would apply to low-income credit unions as well as financial institutions controlled by minorities and women.
- **Interstate Mergers of Minority Banks.** This amendment would allow the FDIC to facilitate interstate bank mergers of institutions with assets *under* $500 million (instead of restricting assistance to those *over* $500 million, as the law presently requires). This would expand opportunities for minority banks threatened with insolvency to merge with other minority banks, even if they are out of state. The alternative for many such institutions has been either to fold or to be taken over by nonminority banks.
- **Minority Outreach.** As the Resolution Trust Corporation (which is to be established by the bail-out bill) addresses the insolvency and merger problems of marginal S & Ls, billions of dollars in federal contracts will be awarded to private accounting and law firms to support the effort. This amendment would ensure that minority firms receive a share of those contracts.

A United Response to Croson

Civil rights and minority business advocates have agreed to establish a task force to develop a common strategy for documenting and responding to the harmful effects of the U.S. Supreme Court's recent decision in *City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co.,* which overturned Richmond's minority business set-aside program. (See *Focus TrendLetter,* January-February 1989.) Lawyers, policymakers, entrepreneurs, and civil rights leaders have been working feverishly to assess the decision's implications, not only for state and local set-aside programs, but also for race-conscious affirmative action programs in general, both public and private.

Proponents of minority set-aside programs point out that the Court's stringent new standards have already begun to place a heavy burden on states and localities to justify the use of their programs as effective remedies for proven discrimination in contracting. **The *Croson* decision, these advocates assert, has already harmed minority businesses, since the courts as well as state and local governments across the country have begun using it to dismantle their set-aside programs. At least 18 programs have been abandoned since the decision was handed down in February.**

Many civil rights advocates, including JULIUS CHAMBERS, counsel-general of the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, fear that the *Croson* case may become a judicial precedent for overturning all forms of affirmative action and equal opportunity programs, including those outside the business arena in such areas as education, employment, voting, and housing. Given the enormous potential for change in policy and practice, civil rights and minority business organizations are formulating a strategy based on thorough study of the new ruling.

Meanwhile, on Capitol Hill, Rep. JOHN CONYERS (D-Mich.) will soon conduct hearings on the *Croson* decision through the House Government Operations Committee, which he chairs. These hearings are expected to result in the introduction of legislation aimed at countering the damaging effects of the Court ruling. Furthermore, minority business groups, such as the Minority Business Legal Defense and Education Fund, are urging state and local jurisdictions to strengthen their set-aside programs rather than discarding them. The Fund's president, **ANTHONY ROBINSON**, is concerned that without access to the government contracts such programs provide, many minority firms will simply go out of business. Minority business advocates are also seeking ways to broaden support in the black community for minority business as well as general economic empowerment.

Apartheid's Attempted Face-Lift

In recent months, the South African regime has embarked on a highly visible public relations campaign to preempt the imposition of comprehensive economic sanctions by the international community. Since last year, South African officials have traveled to four African nations—Mozambique, Malawi, Zaire and the Ivory Coast—ending what had been the regime's almost total isolation on the continent. Officials have also

visited Portugal, Switzerland, and the Federal Republic of Germany and have met with Britain's Prime Minister MARGARET THATCHER in Windhoek, Namibia, in an attempt to win diplomatic and economic cooperation.

The regime has cited as "evidence of its lessening aggression" ongoing regional developments, including South Africa's withdrawal of troops from the People's Republic of Angola as well as its agreement to end its illegal occupation of Namibia, which would allow U.N.-sponsored elections leading to independence there (see "The Price of Namibian Independence," *Focus*, March 1989). In addition, South African officials claim to have reduced domestic repression, pointing to the granting of clemency for the Sharpesville Six (the five men and one woman who had been sentenced to hang for their involvement in a demonstration in the black township of Sharpesville during which one local official was killed) and to the release of long-term political detainees, including **ZWELAKHE SISULU**, the founder and editor of the progressive *New Nation* newspaper (Zwelakhe Sisulu is the son of United Democratic Front [UDF] President **ALBERTINA SISULU** and long-imprisoned African National Congress [ANC] leader **WALTER SISULU**). Furthermore, these officials cite the regime's decision to transfer imprisoned ANC leader **NELSON MANDELA** to a minimum-security facility, its banning of the ultra-right "White Liberation Movement," and its denunciation of Conservative Party attempts to reestablish racially segregated public facilities. Additionally, new Nationalist Party leader **F.W. DE KLERK**, who is expected to win the upcoming presidential elections (State President **P.W. BOTHA** will be retiring in August), has hinted that he may seek to dismantle apartheid laws.

Nevertheless, despite Pretoria's efforts to put a new face on apartheid, the situation for black South Africans is actually deteriorating. As the national state of emergency enters its fourth year, the numbers of detentions, bannings, and deaths are still rising. Thirty-two organizations, having a cumulative membership of more than four million, were banned in 1988 alone, including the UDF, the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU), the National Detainees Forum, and a number of teachers' unions. Blacks who lead nonviolent anti-apartheid campaigns are increasingly found guilty by the courts of "terrorism" and "treason." Opposition newspapers have been either completely shut down or severely restricted in the news coverage they provide. And some leaders of the ANC, including Nelson Mandela and Walter Sisulu, still languish in prison after 27 years; other ANC leaders continue to guide the liberation movement from Lusaka, Zambia, their headquarters-in-exile.

Given the growing crisis inside South Africa, both ANC officials and other anti-apartheid activists within the country have denounced the purported government reforms as mere public relations gestures. "The diplomatic initiative is designed to demoralize internal opposition and to relieve the growing siege of the apartheid economy," the ANC observed in a statement released from Lusaka. The *City Press*, a white-owned South African anti-apartheid newspaper, voiced similar views in an editorial, asking: "What is the point of achieving peace with neighbors when your country is in flames?"

Some international observers are also questioning the purpose of South African officials' meetings with African leaders. These observers agree that the primary reason behind Mozambican President JOACHIM CHISSANO'S decision to negotiate with the apartheid regime was to end the war of terrorism and sabotage conducted by South Africa and the South African-backed rebels known as the Mozambique National Resistance (MNR). This war has brought about the death of over 200,000 Mozambicans and has destroyed roads, railways, farms, schools, hospitals, and health centers valued at more than $5 billion, according to the UNICEF report *Children on the Frontline*.

By contrast, the governments of Zaire, Malawi, and the Ivory Coast have maintained ties with Pretoria for years, even as the rest of Africa has sought its isolation. The ANC says of these meetings that "by attempting to forge links with Africa, [the regime] hopes to win the legitimacy and respectability which it is denied by the overwhelming majority of our people....However, those who open up to Pretoria...are postponing the day when [it] will be forced to speak to the real leaders" of South Africa.

The leaders of the Frontline States (Angola, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Mozambique, Lesotho, Tanzania, and Botswana), the black-ruled countries that neighbor South Africa, have expressed similar views. "Apartheid in South Africa will continue to pose a threat to all the people of the region," argued **GAOSITWE K. CHIEPE**, Botswana's foreign minister, at the United Nations. She stated that until South Africa itself is liberated, "the root cause of the problems of southern Africa will still remain unresolved."

In the United States, opponents of apartheid have also rejected the regime's bid for international recognition and are backing new anti-apartheid initiatives in Congress this year. Congressman RONALD DELLUMS (D-Calif.), the newly elected chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC), introduced a sanctions bill (H.R.21) in the House of Representatives in January. The bill is essentially identical to the one Dellums introduced last year, the Anti-Apartheid Act Amendments of 1988, which the House adopted with bipartisan support (see "House Passes Tougher Sanctions Against South Africa," *Focus TL*, August 1988).

H.R.21 would ban virtually all trade with South Africa except the importation of strategic minerals; require

U.S. corporations, institutions, and private citizens to withdraw all investments from South Africa except those in wholly-owned black businesses; end all U.S. exports to South Africa except farm products, publications, and humanitarian assistance; ban the shipment of oil to South Africa on ships owned, controlled, or registered by American concerns; and prohibit intelligence and military cooperation between the U.S. and South Africa except intelligence relating to Cuban troops in Angola. Dellums' 1988 bill never became law since the companion Senate measure (S.2378), introduced by Sen. **ALAN CRANSTON** (D-Calif.), was never voted on by the full Senate. Dellums' office says that the 1989 version is being delayed until the Senate companion measure (S.507) introduced by Sen. **PAUL SIMON** (D-ILL.) has won the support of Senate Majority Leader **GEORGE MITCHELL** (D-Maine). Groups backing H.R.21 include the CBC, TransAfrica (the Washington, D.C.-based lobbying organization), and the National Rainbow Coalition headed by **JESSE JACKSON.**

Arthur Fletcher to Take Helm of Commission on Civil Rights

ARTHUR FLETCHER, a man with a record of civil rights activism that dates back to the early 1950s, will replace WILLIAM BARCLAY ALLEN as chairman of the U. S. Civil Rights Commission as soon as a vacancy occurs on the commission for Fletcher to fill. Allen, who was appointed by President Ronald Reagan, raised a storm of controversy when he was arrested on February 7 for allegedly kidnapping a 14-year-old Apache girl from an Arizona Indian reservation in the course of intervening personally in the investigation of an adoption case. Fletcher, whose mother was nearly 100 percent American Indian, stated recently, "I don't plan to be going to any Indian reservations." But as he anticipates taking the reins of the commission, which was formed in 1957 to investigate discrimination, Fletcher says he is "pleased to return to toiling in the civil rights vineyards."

Civil rights leaders hope Fletcher's appointment will pull the beleaguered agency out of the mire of recent controversies and that it will restore the public's confidence in it. The commission's previously exemplary record of civil rights monitoring was soiled when President Reagan packed the commission with appointees having little commitment to civil rights. In 1982, **CLARENCE PENDLETON,** a former Urban Leaguer and an outspoken opponent of affirmative action, was appointed chair of the commission: his leadership was adamantly opposed by civil rights advocates throughout his tenure. Pendleton died while holding that office in June 1988. Similar criticism was levelled against the commission's then staff director **LINDA CHAVEZ,** who once proposed that the commission hold hearings on reverse discrimination against white males. She resigned that post in November 1983 and was soundly defeated by Democrat **BARBARA MIKULSKI** in the 1986 race for the U.S. Senate in Maryland. Frustrated with the Civil Rights Commission's domination by these Reagan appointees, black, Hispanic, and women members of the House of Representatives succeeded in having Congress cut its funding in half.

At the moment, Fletcher's nomination is problematic, since there are no vacancies on the eight-member commission for him to fill. Allen, a black Republican whose term expires in 1992, has shown no inclination to resign and commissioners can only be forced out for neglect of duty and malfeasance in office. Since the commission's reauthorization is now under consideration by Congress, the agency's leadership crisis is particularly critical. But according to insiders, the Bush administration is trying to lure away one of the presidentially appointed members from the commission with the offer of a post at another federal agency.

A lifelong Republican who became vice-chair of the Kansas Republican Party in 1954 at the age of 30, Fletcher has had an excellent record of civil rights advocacy. In 1969, President Richard M. Nixon appointed him assistant secretary for employment standards at the U.S. Department of Labor, where he oversaw the formulation of the Revised Philadelphia Plan. This plan for the first time defined discrimination as the absence of blacks in the construction trades and established enforceable standards of affirmative action under Executive Order 11246. The Executive Order requires firms with federal contracts to ensure equal employment opportunity in hiring and promotion through affirmative action. The Revised Philadelphia Plan remains a key precedent in the evolution of national affirmative action enforcement policy.

Fletcher later served as deputy urban affairs advisor to President **GERALD FORD.** After leaving government, he became executive director of the United Negro College Fund and later formed Arthur A. Fletcher & Associates, a consulting firm which maintains food service contracts at military bases and assists corporations in the development of affirmative action programs.

Fletcher believes that the U.S. must eradicate all vestiges of discrimination by the year 2000 if it is to equip coming generations with the skills needed to ensure a fully productive and competitive work force in the next century. "The United States has lost the option of relegating blacks and other minorities to the lowest positions in the labor force," Fletcher says. He has also stated that he wants to return bipartisanship to civil rights policy and to change the perception some may have that the GOP is a haven for racists.

Black Political Empowerment and Economic Advancement

New Study Reveals That Black Businesses Are More Successful in Cities Run by Black Mayors

by Dr. Timothy Bates

This article is based on Dr. Bates' research for a book, which will be published by the Joint Center Press.

The findings are clear. Black political power in City Hall creates an environment in which black businesses flourish. In major cities where black mayors hold office, larger black-owned firms expand, the rate of business failure declines, and more jobs are created for minority workers. These are among the conclusions reached by a recently completed Joint Center study.

While the most common political assumption is that the governance of a black mayor would improve minority access to government procurement, no study has yet documented a *national* pattern supporting this theory. Likewise, although available information on individual cities has shown that college-educated black entrepreneurs are increasingly moving into large-scale enterprises (those with more than $50,000 in annual sales), how this trend is linked to black political leverage has not been established. The Joint Center study is notable, therefore, in confirming for the first time earlier anecdotal accounts linking black political power to these shifts in the growth and nature of black businesses.

The study, which used data from the Census Bureau's "Characteristics of Business Owners Survey" (CBO), analyzed the viability of black-owned businesses operating in 28 metropolitan areas in 1982, comparing 10 cities that had black mayors at the time with 18 that did not (see box for listing). Taking into account regional factors, economic conditions, the education and management experience of business owners, and other forces, the study reveals that black mayors make a significant difference in the strength and viability of black businesses.

The research does not indicate exactly *how* this happens, although it suggests that board and agency appointments by these mayors are a factor. To determine the direct impact on economic advancement caused by black mayors, further research will have to be done at the local level, including individual case studies. Nevertheless, the Joint Center study confirms the fact that political power makes a difference. This is vitally important. When larger-scale black businesses emerge and successfully enter the market for municipal contracts, their gains translate into greater economic stability not only for themselves but for black workers and communities as well.

The Expanding Base for Black Business

Throughout the 1980s, municipal set-aside and procurement programs targeted large-scale minority businesses in such growth fields as wholesale, construction, finance, and business services, commonly referred to as *emerging* minority industries. Black mayors, often with the assistance of minority-controlled city councils, have used their clout to place proponents of set-aside programs in authoritative positions in agencies and on boards—such as school, sanitation, mass transit, parks and recreation—that control most municipal spending.

The increased migration of college-educated blacks with entrepreneurial interests into cities with black mayors suggests the influence these city administrations have. Case studies show that the opportunity to do business with municipalities has lured highly educated blacks into self-employment, a fact consistent with the CBO survey's finding that the proportion of college-educated entrepreneurs is growing most rapidly in Atlanta, Los Angeles, Detroit, and Washington, D.C., cities where black mayors have been presiding for many years.

Until the recent rise of sophisticated black-owned firms, few black businesses had been in a position to participate in the macroeconomies of major cities. Previously, the typical black-owned business was a mom-and-pop operation—a food store, a beauty parlor, a barbershop. These operations, concentrated in black neighborhoods and serving a local clientele, are generally run by entrepreneurs with little formal business training. Over the past twenty years, this type of enterprise has been in continuous de-

(Continued on page 6)

Cities Included in the Study

Led by Black Mayors, 1982: **Atlanta, Birmingham, Detroit, Gary, Los Angeles, Newark, New Orleans, Oakland, Richmond, Washington, D.C.**

Led by Non-Black Mayors, 1982: **Baltimore, Chicago, Cleveland, Columbus, Dallas, Houston, Indianapolis, Jackson, Jacksonville, Kansas City, Memphis, Milwaukee, Nashville, New York, Omaha, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Shreveport**

Dr. Bates is a professor of economics at the University of Vermont and a visiting scholar at the Joint Center.

Black Political Empowerment

(Continued from page 5)

cline in terms of sales, markets and other indicators of viability. While these types of firms—small-scale retail and personal services—remain the most common field for start-up businesses among black entrepreneurs today, it is a field that suffers very high failure rates irrespective of the presence of a black mayor. Moreover, businesses in this field are by their nature precluded from competing for set-aside municipal contracts; their success is rarely affected by decisions made in the mayor's office. For this reason, the study chose to exclude (and the figures below overlook) businesses in this more traditional minority field.

Black enterprises in emerging industries today, commonly run by entrepreneurs with college degrees, are larger in scale, on average, than firms starting up in the traditional retail and personal services fields. These larger operations do not rely on a minority clientele but sell to units of government and to other businesses, including large corporations. Many minority construction firms, for example, have been formed in response to public-sector opportunities in highway and building construction. Wholesalers and retailers of office supply products and brokers of municipal bonds have also sprung up to meet new demands. Corporate and government programs of minority procurement and set-asides have contributed heavily to the growth of these operations.

Political Power and Black Business Expansion

The positive influence of black mayors is evident in the comparative success of new black firms located in their cities. Increased procurement opportunities there for minority entrepreneurs have led to more minority start-ups of larger-scale firms, the type best able to compete for government contracts.

Sales and employment levels show that minority firms in cities with black mayors are much more successful than those in the 18 other cities and have lower rates of failure. Black owners of these firms are more likely to be college graduates, and they are making much larger capital investments in their firms, both of which improve their chances of success. Table 1 documents the larger size and scope of black business startups (those formed between 1976 and 1982).

The difference between the two sets of cities in the average capital investment made by new owners in the emerging fields is noteworthy—$25,432 for those in the black-mayor group, which is 34.5 percent larger than the average of $18,915 in the other 18 cities. By contrast, older black-owned firms (set up before 1976) operating in the same emerging industries showed average investments that were very similar, $9,989 in the black-mayor cities and $10,670 in the other group. This difference in investment and the differing rates of business failure together serve as strong evidence of the supportive environment for new businesses nurtured by black mayoral management.

Logically, differences in success brought about by aggressive procurement policies should be clearest among the larger businesses, since they are the only ones directly affected by municipal procurement. This can be tested by dividing all black-owned firms into "employers" (firms large enough to have employees) and others (those without any paid employees). What emerges from this comparison only confirms the differences revealed by the more general examination. Employer firms in the black-mayor group reported sales that were 52 percent higher and employee staff size that was 87 percent higher than corresponding firms in the other areas (see table 2). Moreover, their business failure rates were 17 percent lower.

Serious barriers nonetheless exist for black firms in both types of cities, particularly in amassing the capital funds needed to launch large-scale ventures. Findings from earlier studies show that black owners starting firms are likely to have more difficulty raising funds than owners of any other ethnic group.

(Continued on page 8)

Table 1. Traits of Black-Owned Firms Formed Between 1976 and 1982 in Emerging Fields

	Cities Led by Black Mayors	*Cities Led by Non-black Mayors*
No. employees per firm (1982)	0.8	0.4
Average sales per firm (1982)	$53,793	$35,953
Mean financial capital per firm	25,432	18,915
Percent of firms with paid employees	20.8%	20.1%
Percent of owners having four or more years of college	38.3	33.8
Percent of firms receiving bank loans	17.9	23.0
Percent of firms still operating in 1986	72.9	66.9
Number of firms in sample	*347*	*417*

Table 2. Traits of Black-Owned Firms That Are Employers in Emerging Fields, 1982

	Cities led by Black Mayors	*Cities Led by Non-black Mayors*
No. employees per firm	4.3	2.3
Average sales per firm	$160,022	$105,361
Percent of firms relying on a predominantly minority clientele	49.1%	54.8%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, "Characteristics of Business Owners" Survey, 1986.

Minorities and Privatization: Economic Mobility at Risk

New Joint Center Publication Reveals That Black Municipal Workers Feel the Employment Squeeze as City Governments Privatize Their Services

Privatization, the practice of contracting with private firms to provide public services, has grown rapidly among municipal governments seeking to cut costs or streamline their operations. Yet a detailed study by Robert M. Suggs, associate professor at the Arizona State University College of Law and formerly a senior research associate at the Joint Center, concludes that such schemes may pose a risk to the employment opportunities and general economic advancement of minorities. In the 10 cities Suggs studied, privatization tended to reduce the quality of employment available to low-skilled minority workers as well as the quality of public services available to low-income citizens.

Municipal employee unions have also criticized privatization, pointing out that private firms, unlike municipal agencies, are subject to the economic vagaries of the marketplace, are often inexperienced in providing municipal services, and are several steps removed from the processes of public accountability. However, how privatization affects minority employees, service users, and business owners had not been systematically studied before. *Minorities and Privatization: Economic Mobility at Risk,* soon to be released by the Joint Center, profiles municipal privatization schemes in 10 scattered cities based on research carried out between 1981 and 1983. Each of the cities had a combined black and Hispanic population comprising 20 to 50 percent of its citizenry. The 10 cities are Boston, Newark, Trenton, Fort Lauderdale, Memphis, Jackson (Miss.), Grand Rapids, Houston, Phoenix, and Tucson. Following are selected highlights from the study.

Vulnerable Black City Employees. Blacks working in government may have a special reason to be concerned by privatization. More than other minority populations, blacks often rely on government employment as a route to escaping discrimination in the private job market. In 1980, 27 percent of all employed blacks worked for local, state, or federal government, compared with 16 percent of nonblacks.

The concentration of black employees in low-ranking positions makes them especially vulnerable to layoffs caused by privatization. This was evident in Phoenix, where the municipal job losses resulting from the privatization of a single city program were 88 percent minority, even though the city work force as a whole was only 30 percent minority.

Laid-Off, Low-skilled Workers Lose Pay and Benefits. For a few skilled specialties, such as vehicle maintenance, the range of commercial wages roughly parallels the range of municipal wages, with little evident loss in income, benefits, and career mobility. But for lower-skilled workers, such as those in tree maintenance and trash collection, both wages and benefits at commercial firms are usually inferior to those available in government.

Furthermore, when low-skilled employees are pushed out of public employment, their limited education and background severely restrict their mobility in the private job market, forcing them to accept similar positions at a considerable loss in wages. Municipal trash collectors, who unlike many low-skilled workers can readily find private employment in an industry in great demand, nevertheless were consistently forced to accept lower wages when they left government, and they often lost most of their benefits, including pensions, which has been a severe blow to long-term security. The stability of subsequent employment can suffer as well. In Tucson, Phoenix, and Houston, for example, when tree planting and trimming were municipal agency occupations, they were stable and well-paying. But when contracted to private firms, they became seasonal or part-time positions paying much less.

Suggs' study also shows that minority business owners gain few city contracts resulting from privatization. Their participation accounts for less than two percent of all the dollars spent on the privatization contracts reviewed.

Recommendations. Suggs argues that municipalities engaged in privatization can work to limit these harmful outcomes for minorities by strategic planning. They might choose to privatize only after rigorous cost-benefit comparisons warrant the shift; establish ways to monitor contracted operations closely; make outplacement services available to displaced public employees and give those employees priority in any new municipal hiring; and establish an independent and well-supported program for minority-business procurement, allowing flexibility in seeking minority subcontracts and in setting requirements for small firms. ■

Copies can be purchased through the Order Department, Joint Center for Political Studies Press, 4720 Boston Way, Lanham, MD 20706; telephone 301-459-3366.

This book review was prepared by Marc DeFrancis, senior editor at the Joint Center.

Black Political Empowerment

(Continued from page 6)

Black mayors, the study suggests, have no leverage when it comes to businesses' being redlined by commercial banks. In fact, the evidence shows that a *smaller* percentage of owners in the black-mayor group received bank loans than in the other cities. This problem is partly rooted in the fact that emerging black firms were concentrated in minority neighborhoods, especially in Detroit and Atlanta, two cities where loan access was a severe problem. (The type of redlining that occurs in Atlanta was documented in 1988 in a Pulitzer Prize winning series of articles by the *Atlanta Journal and Constitution.*)

Limited access to capital means that black business start-ups which might otherwise be competitive in bidding for government procurement are severely handicapped. Access to little or no debt capital in most instances limits owners to creating small businesses, a problem made worse by the fact that such firms suffer the highest failure rates. Furthermore, limited access to debt depresses the overall rate of business formation, particularly in such capital-intensive fields as manufacturing.

Furthering Progress

The development of a healthy small-business community requires three key ingredients: talented and capable entrepreneurs, access to financial capital, and access to markets. The Joint Center study shows that the best progress in black business has been achieved among large-scale firms operating in large cities governed by black mayors. These firms are the ones that are most likely to benefit from preferential procurement and set-aside programs. They are also the firms most likely to be headed by college graduates and to have enjoyed the largest investment of financial capital.

While the study did not allow for a systematic examination of how the mayoral influence is exercised, it does verify that this influence exists regardless of the differences between communities. Further study of this process is necessary, especially in light of the Supreme Court ruling in *Richmond v. Croson,* since the tools at the disposal of black mayors are likely to become fewer in number and these municipal executives will need all the leverage they can muster. ■

JCPS and WETA Document Urban Teen Crisis

The Joint Center for Political Studies and WETA-TV, the Public Broadcasting System (PBS) flagship station in Washington, D.C., are coproducing a documentary entitled, "Turning It Around: Urban Teens in Crisis." The program, hosted and narrated by *McNeil/Lehrer News Hour* reporter Kwame Holman, focuses on four teenagers struggling to overcome the problems common to many young people living in today's urban ghettoes. The documentary follows their stories to gain insight into the problems of drug abuse, violence, homelessness, dropping out of school, and teen pregnancy. It also examines a variety of programs designed to help young people overcome or avoid these problems. The program debuts on WETA-TV at 8:00 p.m. on June 6, 1989, and will be offered to PBS stations nationwide this fall. The Joint Center's involvement in this project was made possible by a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation.

FOCUS
Joint Center for
Political Studies®

1301 Pa. Ave., N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 626-3500

NOTICE TO READERS: Please notify FOCUS of any change of address or title. YOU MUST ATTACH THE MAILING LABEL FROM THE BACK COVER when writing about service or change of address. No change can be made without this information. Allow 6 weeks for change of address to take effect. Thank you.

NON-PROFIT
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT No. 6958
Washington, D.C.

ADDRESS
CORRECTION
REQUESTED

Postmaster: Form 3547 requested

26063
SRI
Acquisitions Editor
Congressional Info Svc, Inc.
4520 East-West Hwy.
Bethesda, MD 20814